1816
zz 9

TWO *Grammatical Treatiſes:*

VIZ.

I. ANIMADVERSIONS on the *Latin* Grammar lately publiſhed by Mr. *Robert Trotter* Schoolmaſter at *Drumfries*;

By Mr. JOHN LOVE *Schoolmaſter at* Dumbarton.

II. A DISSERTATION upon the Way of teaching that Language: Wherein the Objections raiſed againſt Mr. *Ruddiman*'s and other ſuch like Grammars, for their being too full and particular, are anſwered and confuted; And the vulgar Practice of teaching *Latin* by a Grammar writ in the ſame Language, is juſtified and defended.

Together with ſome critical Remarks on the new Latin *Grammar compoſed by Mr.* John Clarke *Schoolmaſter at* Hull, *And on the Uſe he would have to be made of his literal Tranſlations.*

By another Hand.

——— Brevis eſſe laboro,
Obſcurus fio. ———
Interdum vulgus rectum videt. —— } Horat.

EDINBURGH, Printed in the Year MDCCXXXIII.

9

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Viro Doctiſſimo, ROBERTO TROTTERO, *Ludi apud* Drumfriſienſes *Magiſtro,* S.

NON dubito, *Trottere* doctiſſime, quin mirere, quâ fiduciâ, aut quibus viribus fretus, literas ad te, hominem mihi prorſus ignotum, ac in re Grammaticâ diu multumque verſatum, mittere auſim. Temeritatem meam, ſi modò hoc nomine nuncupanda ſit, excuſabit, ſpero, apud æquos harum rerum judices, indignatio, quâ non pauci mecum fremebant, te, quâ haud ſpernendâ alioquin polles eruditione & experientiâ, Scholis noſtris exſanguia Linguæ *Latinæ* compendia, obſcuritatis nunquam non plena, rurſus obtrudere; ſiniſtramque adeò, quæ nimis diu hactenus Scholas noſtras infeſtas habebat, novas indies ſine fine Grammaticas procudendi conſuetudinem, revocare velle. Cl. *Ruddimannus* vix manum ad pravum hunc morem amoliendum ſalutarem admoverat, & ſuas Grammaticæ *Latinæ* Inſtitutiones in lucem ediderat, quin ſtatim, unanimi ferè omnium conſenſu, ſolæ judicarentur dignæ, quæ pueris in Scholis noſtris prælegerentur: quin etiam bonis omnibus ſpes fuit, neminem deinde alium, qui nominis ſui famam magni haberet, curta iſta *Latinæ* linguæ compendia aggreſſurum.

Video, Vir doctiſſime, te aliter hîc ſentire: audiamus igitur, quibus rationibus adductus compendium tuum concinnare decreveris. Dicis te, *ad octodecim antè annos, cum plerique obſcuritatis & ineptiarum ruderibus penè obrutam rem Grammaticam cernerent pariter & dolerent, eam rem aggredi auſum.* Laudandum profectò fuit in hoc miſero rerum ſtatu conſilium tuum; nam quin hæ graviſſimæ fuerint rationes, Grammaticam in

16

puerorum gratiam accuratiorem conficiendi, tibi præſertim, qui *ab ineunte ætate huic arti docendæ operam dederas*, inficiandum non eſt. *Cum autem*, pergis, *Rudimenta* Ruddimanni *in publicum interim prodiiſſent, & Grammatica ab eodem Auctore perpolita promitteretur, ab incepto eo te* ais *prorſus deſtitiſſe, & quas tum confeceras ſchedulas, quaſi ſcruta, abjeciſſe.* Perpulchrè quidem: ſed, ut videtur, mutandum tibi fuit poſtea propoſitum, & vitæ etiam genus, quod ipſe diſertè dicis, *ab hilaritate* nimirum *in curarum abyſſum*; & vix aliter fieri potuit, cum Grammaticorum limen intrare cogitares. Veruntamen non ſine cauſa ab incepto tuo eo uſque ſaltem deſtitiſti, donec *Ruddimanni* Grammatica in lucem prodiret; nam ea reverâ in rem tuam ceſſit in compendio tuo exarando. *Ruddimannum* enim iiſdem ſæpenumero veſtigiis conſequeris, iiſdem non rarò verbis, quibus ille, uteris; adeò ut, niſi aliter nos ipſe docuiſſes, dejerare quis poſſet, te ſcrinia illius compilâſſe; quantumvis *portentoſam* illius *longitudinem*, ſuſpiriis ex imo pectore (quis dubitet?) repetitis, tantopere dolere videaris. Cum autem ab illo diſſentire in animum tibi induxeris, (quis enim in illius, aut cujuſvis alîus hominis verba, niſi quum ratione aut probâ auctoritate ſuffulciantur, jurare velit?) ſæpe falſa, haud rarò ambigua & inepta nobis tradidiſti. Sed, ni fallor, ſpem, in quam de *Ruddimanno* veneras, falſam deprehendiſti. Fieri poteſt: num etiam Grammaticam illius *obſcuritatis & ineptiarum ruderibus obrutam* dolebas? Hoc non dicis, nec ab ullo, perfrictæ licet frontis, homine dici poteſt. Quæ tum ratio te impulit, ut rem hanc, arduam ſane & laborioſam, aggrederere? Hoc ex ſeqq. verbis tuis patebit. *Prodiit tandem & hæc* (Ruddimanni) *Grammatica*; *at proh dolor! in portentoſam porrecta longitudinem, & univerſo prope conſenſu,*

ſenſu, non pueris, Magiſtris verò ipſis erudiendis adornata, adeò ut Grammatica virilis, prout ipſe in præfatione ſua innuere videtur dicendam, meritò ſanè nuncupanda ſit. Jam quàm falſa & inepta hæc ſint, quid attinet dicere? Tibine, Vir doctiſſime, gemitus & dolorem ciebat, celeberrimum *Ruddimannum* noſtratem, palmam cæteris omnibus, quos mihi videre contigit, præripuiſſe; Grammaticamque ſcholis noſtris, methodo, cum ad docendum, tum ad diſcendum, longè quàm antehac accuratiore ac faciliore concinnâſſe? In *portentoſam* tamen dicis illam *porrigi longitudinem.* Hoc autem, pace tuâ, Vir optime, pernego. Intra modum enim, quatenus res ſinebat, ſe continuit. Quippe ea eſt, ut benè noſti, *Latinæ* linguæ varietas, ea eſt linguæ illius, omnium aliarum facile principis, copia & ubertas, *latiùſque fines ſuos ea extendit*, ut *Ruddimanni* verbis utar, *quàm ut anguſtis hiſce, quos illi conſtituitis, limitibus coarctari ſe patiatur.*

Deinde dicis, *Grammaticam* illius, *virilem, prout ipſe in præfatione ſuâ innuere videtur dicendam, meritò ſanè nuncupandam eſſe.* Quid, quæſo, vis hiſce verbis? *Ruddimanni* præfationem ſemel iterumque relegi, nihil tale ibi reperio, immo nihil tale ibi reperiri poſſe fidenter aſſeverare audeo. Annon Vir eruditiſſimus in ipſo titulo ſe Grammaticæ *Latinæ* Inſtitutiones facili ad puerorum captum methodo accommodâſſe dicit? Quî igitur tibi in mentem venit, illam *Virilem* appellare, quod vix *Latinè* ſonat; & *Ruddimannum* ipſum barbaræ iſtius locutionis auctorem affirmare? Quam iniquus hac in re Viro Cl. fueris, tibi ipſi judicandum relinquo. Ingruentibus tuis annis, Vir doctiſſime, & canitiei, quam non ſemel in præfatione memoras, meliùs conſuluiſſes, ſi nunquam incubuiſſes *arido huic ſtudio*: quod utinam etiam tacuiſſes; neque eo nomine, tu

ipſe

ipſe Grammaticus artem Grammaticam, quam ſummos olim viros excolere nequaquam puduit, elevâſſes. Sed pergis: *Méne ab aliorum operibus Grammaticis, quorum aniles nugæ dulciſſimos ſæpe, inter ſeria, riſus ciebant, in cramben prolixam imprudens præcipitavero? exanimandum præbuero? Opus virile teneris puerorum humeris impoſuero? Non convenit: immò verò non oportet. Quid multa? arma rurſus deſucta imparibus licet humeris indui, & opus hoc qualecunque tandem exaravi.* Quæ, amabo, eſt iſthæc ſartago loquendi? Quantum hîc te ipſum diſcrucias, ut ſummus Grammaticorum audias? Metuo tamen, ne tantum laborem fruſtra ſuſceperis;

Non tali auxilio, nec defenſoribus iſtis
Tempus eget. ———

Audiamus jam te pauliſper diſſerentem de methodo, quam in compendio tuo concinnando obſervaveris. *In Etymologia, irregularia regularibus nomina propriis ferè ſuis claſſibus ſubjunximus, ſatius ducentes hâc uti methodo, quàm immenſam vocum, abſque aliqua affinitate, congeriem, pueris propè carnificinam, ſub regulæ forma memoriæ mandandam proponere.* Hanc tamen quàm tibi ipſi dixeras legem, uti infra oſtendetur, nequaquam ſemper tenuiſti. Irregularia quidem, quæ rarò occurrunt, obſervâſti; quæ autem ſæpius, hæc prorſus omiſiſti. Verùm eòdem res redit, nam uti illa hic & illic diſpertiviſti, & tumultuariè quaſi collocâſti, nulli erunt pueris uſui. Profectò facilius fuiſſet, & ſine dubio brevius, ſemel tradidiſſe, irregularia hæc nomina, eſſe antiquæ tantum *Romæ* ſordes, pueris carnificinam, non utilitatem paritura, & proinde te ſicco pede illa percurriſſe, nullaſque de eis Regulas condidiſſe: & ita quidem, ut puerorum tuorum, ſic etiam tuo ipſius labori parſiſſes.

Quod

Quod ad Syntaxin attinet, dicis te, *Adjectivorum & Verborum, ad idem commune caput pertinentium, Regimen unâ eâdemque comprehendisse regulâ, ut brevitati simul, & puerorum, quibus hæc divisim tradita, ex longo docendi usu, haud parum officere animadverteras, captui eo meliùs consuleres.* Verùm, præterquam quòd illa, quam tu sequutus es, Syntaxin juxta casuum seriem tradendi, methodus, minus distincta rationique consona videatur; cum *Ruddimanni* Rudimenta, ubi prorsus diversa rei tractandæ ratio habetur, discipulis tuis prælegenda inter primos curaveris, meliùs illorum captui, eandem quam ille institerit hac in re viam servando, consuluisses, quàm primùm illos *Ruddimanni* Syntaxin docendo, & deinde animos ipsorum Syntaxi tuâ, alio rursus, eoque haud æquè concinno ordine dispositâ, distrahendo. Rectius fortè fecisses, si hanc Grammatices partem prorsus intactam transiliisses, cum parum ex curta illa tua miserèque involuta Syntaxeos tradendæ ratione, quod non priùs è Rudimentis didicerant, pueri haurire queant. Aliter se res habet in *Ruddimanni* Syntaxi, in qua, regulis eâdem quâ in Rudimentis methodo, iisdemque quantum licuit verbis, perscriptis, multæ utilissimæ & ad pleniorem sermonis *Latini* cognitionem plurimùm conducentes Annotationes adjiciuntur. Quam propterea partem à nonnullis Præceptoribus negligi, haudquaquam probari posse existimo.

Postea dicis, *Te eâ in regulis omnibus brevitate simul ac perspicuitate usum, ut facillimo negotio vel modici ingenii puer primo eas propè intuitu planè percipere ac intelligere possit.* Brevitate quidem te maximopere delectari lubentissimè agnosco; quanta autem tibi fuerit perspicuitatis cura, quo pacto etiam regulas tuas puerorum captui accommodaveris, ex sequentibus in Gram-

matticam

maticam tuam Animadversionibus apparebit, confido. Profectò ob crebras quibus uteris elisiones, ob inve- nustum & abruptum admodum verborum ordinem, tanta in versibus tuis exoritur asperitas, adeoque du- riter plerumque ii sonant, ut non solùm æquis auribus fastidio sint, verùm etiam pueri nec numeros tuos me- minisse, nec verba tenere queant. Postremò, *Temporis dispendio*, inquis, *quod in aliis Grammaticis docendis necessariò intervenit, dum jubentur pueri priùs regulam & regulæ deinde partem attingere, omnino ferè te consulu- isse: ea enim ipsâ pars regulæ*, in tua Grammatica, *sine ullâ ambage, rem plerumque demonstrat, quæ rogatur.* Magnum jam quid te confeciſſe, hâc tibi propriâ re- gulas tuas disponendi methodo, arbitraris; sed mul- tum falleris: nihil enim illâ insulsius, nihil ineptius à quoquam fingi potuit.

Video te, Vir doctissime, nimiâ brevitatis cupidita- te, maximoque, qui vix ferri potest, novitatis & affe- ctationis pruritu abreptum, non rarò hallucinatum, multaque falsa, ambigua aut inepta in Grammaticâ tuâ tradidisse; quam idcirco Animadversionibus sequen- tibus dignam censueram. Nolim tamen existimes, me tui vituperandi causâ hoc feciſſe; verùm eo præ- cipuè consilio, ut ostendere conarer, curta ista & je- juna linguæ *Latinæ* compendia, ad pueros in re Gram- maticâ instituendos nequaquam esse idonea. Num verò hanc metam attigerim, æquis harum rerum arbi- tris dirimendum relinquo. Nihil est quod amplius te moneam, nisi me fideliter ubique & plenè verba tua repetiviſſe, ut ii, quibus Grammaticæ tuæ copia non suppeteret, *Animadversiones* sequentes, quales qua- les eæ sint, legere possent. Vale. Dabam Britan- noduni, Kal. Decembribus, Anno Æræ Christianæ, M.DCC.XXXIII.

ANI-

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE Latin Grammar

Lately Publiſhed by

Mr. *Robert Trotter*.

PAG. 1. lin. 3. *Grammaticæ, quæ eſt ars rectè loquendi ſcribendique, partes ſunt quatuor.*

Mr. *Trotter* here, for the ſake of an affected Brevity, has jumbled together the Definition and Diviſion of Grammar, which muſt needs perplex the young Scholar at his Entry to this Performance.

l. 5. *Etymologia, quæ de vocibus; Syntaxis, quæ de oratione agit.*

No doubt it is for the ſame Reaſon he has here omitted to ſay, *ſingulis vocibus*, and, *vocibus conjunctis*, as Mr. *Ruddiman* has it, and is a more accurate Account of the Matter. For Conſtruction treats of Words, as well as Etymology; but with this Difference indeed, that the former conſiders Words as joined together in a Sen-

tence, the latter conſiders them ſeparately and by themſelves. And this is evident from the Definitions he himſelf afterwards gives of both, wherein *Voces*, or Words, are ſet down as the Subject-matter of them; which are alſo borrowed by him from Mr. *Ruddiman*.

I. 2 1. *Præcipua Nominis & Pronominis accidentia ſunt, Declinatio, genus, numerus, caſus & perſona. Præcipua verbi accidentia ſunt, Voces, modus, tempus, numerus & perſona.*

'Tis not eaſy to find why our Author has not reckoned them all up, and afterwards explained them: But eſpecially, why has he omitted *motio* and *comparatio* of a Noun, and *genus* and *conjugatio* of a Verb? 'Tis the more incongruous in him to have omitted *conjugatio*, when *declinatio*, which has no more Concern with a Noun or Pronoun, than *conjugatio* hath with a Verb, is yet reckoned up by him among the Accidents of theſe. This kind of Brevity is attended with ſuch Obſcurity, that Youth can never improve by it in the Knowledge of *Latin* Grammar. It will hold here, as well as in moſt things elſe, what was long ſince obſerved by *Horace*:

——— ——— *Brevis eſſe laboro,*
Obſcurus fio. ——— ———

Again, how comes this Author to reckon up *voces* among the principal Accidents of a Verb, when, properly ſpeaking, it is no ſuch thing, but as it is comprehended under *genus*; and he himſelf ſeems to reckon it ſo afterwards?

l. ult. *Communia omnium vocum accidentia ſunt ſpecies & figura.*

This is falſely ſaid, for *ſpecies* is not an Accident of a Participle, but eſſential to it, ſince every Participle muſt neceſſarily be derived from a Verb. Mr. *Trotter* it would appear has fallen into this Miſtake from what is ſaid by Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Gr. maj. p. 3. n.* 12. *Ex his duo poſtrema* (*nim. ſpecies & figura*) *omnibus orationis partibus communia ſunt*: But when he comes to treat of the Participle diſtinctly by itſelf, he has mended the Matter; for, *p.* 303. *n.* 9. he ſays, *Species non eſt participii accidens, cùm ex ejus natura ſive eſſentia ſit, ut à verbo ſit derivatum.*

P. 2.

P. 2. l. 4. *Figura vocum eſt duplex : alia enim eſt ſimplex ; ut, amo : alia compoſita ; ut, redamo.*

Why did not this Author define *ſimplex & compoſita figura*, as well as he did the *ſpecies primitiva & derivativa* ? There was as much Reaſon for doing the one as the other. I can't think this is methodical.

l. 7. *Nomen vel eſt ſubſtantivum*, &c.

Here Mr. *Trotter* gives the Diviſion of a Noun, without any Definition of it. Which Omiſſion is the more remarkable, as without it, the Diſtinction betwixt it and a Pronoun, nay and a Participle too, is no where through all this Grammar deſcribed. To what purpoſe is it to aſſign eight Parts or Claſſes of Speech, without ſhewing any where what it is that diſtinguiſhes them from one another ? I can't comprehend what ſort of Scholars this Compend of *Latin* Grammar can make : They muſt needs be very ſuperficial ones, when they are thus bewilder'd on their Entrance to it. If it ſhall be ſaid, that their Definitions and diſtinguiſhing Characters are given in the Rudiments, and therefore it was not neceſſary to repeat them here : Why then are the Diviſions of a Noun and ſome of its Accidents deſcribed here, which are as fully, and much more accurately deſcribed there ? This is alſo immethodical, and is the more glaring, that when he comes in the Courſe of his Grammar to treat of a Verb, he immediately falls about its Preterites and Supines, without any Deſciption either of its Nature or Accidents, contrary to what he does here of a Noun.

l. 17. *Subſtantiva, quæ & marem & feminam reſpiciunt, communis ſunt generis ; ut,* hic & hæc parens.

It will eaſily appear to any one peruſing Mr. *Trotter*'s Compend, that he has borrowed a good deal from Mr. *Ruddiman*'s Grammar, and particularly in ſome of the Deſcriptions he gives us in this Page, with little or no Variation ; which yet he does not acknowledge : Nay ſo far from that, he pretends he had eighteen Years ago begun the Work he has now at laſt offered to the Publick. But when he comes to give Deſcriptions of his own, they are indeed ſingular, and for the moſt part falſe. This the Reader will ſee from the preſent Remark. If by *reſpiciunt* here he means, include in their general Signification both male and female ; this is abſolutely falſe :

For there are a great many Nouns, which in their general Signification include both Sexes, which yet are never uſed in the feminine, *i. e.* have an Adjective feminine joined with them; ſuch as, *homo*, *fur*, *agricola*, *&c.* which, though they may be ſaid of a Woman, and conſequently reſpect a Female, as he expreſſes it, yet are never found joined with an Adjective feminine. This Mr. *Ruddiman* diſtinctly ſhews, *Gr. maj. p.* 4. *n.* 17. Nay by the looſe Way of ſpeaking he here uſes, one might infer, that *beſtia*, *avis*, *proles*, *ſoboles*, *&c.* were ſometimes of the maſculine, *liberi* ſometimes of the feminine, *mancipium* and *ſcortum* of both: For it is certain theſe and ſuch like Words include in their general Signification both Sexes.

l. 19. *Dubii autem generis ſubſtantiva dicuntur illa, quæ nec marem nec feminam reſpicientia, nunc hujus, nunc illius, pro auctorum arbitrio, ſunt generis; ut,* hic *aut* hæc dies.

Neither is this true, for there are ſeveral Words, which reſpect or include in their general Signification both male and female, which are yet of the dubious, not common Gender; as, *anguis*, *ſerpens*, *grus*, *lynx*, *talpa*, *dama*; and good Authors have uſed them, ſometimes in the maſculine, ſometimes in the feminine, without any Regard to the Difference of their Sex. See *Perizon. in Sanct l.* 1. *cap.* 7. and *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 3. *n.* 14. and *p.* 7. *n.* 25. *circa fin.* I wiſh Mr. *Trotter* had conſidered what is ſaid by theſe Authors there, and that probably would have prevented his Miſtake in this Matter.

l. 32. *Mas* hic *vult: femella dat* hæc: *commune dat* hic, hæc.

Here is Brevity with a Witneſs, where three Rules of all other Grammars, I have yet ſeen, are crammed into one.

l. 33. *Omnia nomina marium, ſeu de quibus mas ſolus prædicari poteſt, maſculini ſunt generis; ut,* hic Gabriel, Jupiter, Carolus, &c.

Here our Author, who pretends to have adapted his Compend to the Capacities of young Beginners, gives a Logical Term never uſed by good Authors in this Senſe: Which is the leſs excuſable, that other Words occurred, not only unexceptionable, but fitter to expreſs what is here intended. Beſides, this Author, through that affected

fected Brevity which runs through the whole of his Performance, hath omitted here to reckon up the several Sorts of Nouns that belong to this Rule, leaving these, no doubt, to be delivered *viva voce* by the Master, or to be learned by the Scholar's own Sagacity. The latter is not much to be trusted to: And as to the former, I am persuaded their being set down in the Book would make a deeper Impression, than their being taken from the Master's Mouth only. But I'd gladly know, whether these Gentile Words, *Persa, Macedo, Tros, Cres, &c.* belong to this Rule. If they do, why does not he give one Example of that kind? If they do not, pray under what other Rule are they comprehended? If it shall be said, that they are a kind of Adjectives, but of the masculine Gender only: Then why is that no where told? If it be alledged, that they are but few, and rarely occur: Neither is that true, for there are a good Number of them, and which pretty frequently occur in good Authors. Nay, *p.* 58. *l.* 34. he makes *Arcas* a Substantive, and ought therefore to have given an Example here of such Gentile Substantives.

l. 37. Hæc Juno, Maria, &c.

The same Objection is to be made here, as against the Names of Males: The several Sorts whereof ought to have been distinctly enumerated both here and there. And as there is not so much as one Example of a masculine Gentile Noun there, so neither here of a feminine one, as *Troas, Sicelis, Cressa, &c.*

l. 39. *Quæ autem, sub una terminatione, & de mare & de femina prædicantur, communis sunt generis.*

This, as was already said, is not true: For a great many Words are predicated of both Sexes, which yet are not of the common Gender, as *homo, fur, pugil, &c.* For this Reason no doubt it is, that *Vossius, Johnson*, but Mr. *Ruddiman* more fully in his Grammar, have particularly reckoned up Nouns that are truly of the common Gender. By which it is to be understood, that all others, which do include in their general Signification, or may be predicated of both Sexes, yet are never feminine, *i. e.* are not capable of having an Adjective feminine joined with them.

P. 3. l. 1. *Irregularia.*

The very Place of what follows is irregular. For, as the Author tells us in his Preface, he hath put the irregular Nouns immediately

ly after the regular, in their proper Claſſes; and ſo they ought to be according to his Method, (which yet on other Accounts is a very confuſed one:) And yet he tranſgreſſeth it in the very Beginning. For here he is treating of the Genders of Nouns only, and not of their Declenſion; and yet the Irregularity of the Nouns he here mentions, ſuch as *Adam*, *Job*, *&c.* conſiſts in their Declenſion, not in their Gender. And the ſame Blunder (for I can call it no better) runs through ſome other Parts of his Grammar. And here I cannot omit taking notice of one great Irregularity, or want of Method, our Author is guilty of, *viz.* that he no where divides his Parts of Grammar into Books, Chapters or Sections, and ſometimes he omits to give us the general Titles that ſhould diſtinguiſh the Things treated of from one another, and has no Numbers (except as to his Verſe Rules) or other Signs, to ſhew the Order in which they ly. Here alſo it is remarkable, that though the running Title bears, *De nominum generibus*, yet that Title is not ſet down in its proper Place in the Body of the Book: But when he comes to the Declenſion of Nouns, he has thought fit to give us a general Title, *De nominum declinatione.* If this is not very irregular, I know not what is.

l. 8. *Dant Epicœna ferè finis genus*; hic *ſed* onyx
Hic Phœnix, &c. [*vult*,

It does not appear ſo natural a Way, to ſet down the Epicene Nouns, whoſe Genders are different from that of their Termination, as Mr. *Trotter* does here, and ſome others before him, by way of Exception from a general Rule. I ſhould think it much better, to place them all, as Mr. *Ruddiman* has done, under the ſpecial Rules of Termination, to which it is certain the Cuſtom of the *Latin* Tongue had chiefly a Regard with reſpect to their Genders. But I will not contend with him as to that, what I moſt blame here is, that his Exceptions are neither complete, nor he uniform in his Method: For ſome he hath omitted altogether, as *palumbes*, *ſerpens*, *anguis* and *lynx*, of the dubious Gender, which are neither mentioned here, nor yet in the ſpecial Rules. Others are mentioned in the ſpecial Rules, as *vermis* and *ſeps* maſc. which ſhould have come in here, as well as *onyx*, *glis*, *ſalar*. For the firſt of theſe he'll perhaps ſay, that they are of the common Gender: But then he muſt ſhew that they are never uſed maſculine but when the Male is ſignified, nor feminine but when the Female; which I'm ſure he cannot do, and is contrary to the Opinion of the beſt Criticks and Grammarians.

In this Page too, and afterwards, he gives the *Engliſh* of ſome irregular

regular Nouns, which is not uniform, ſince he remits to his Examples at the End for the *Engliſh* of all other Words.

l. penult. *Singulari caret* Alpes, *legitur tamen apud Lucanum* Alpis *in* Gen. *ſing.*

Since our Author condeſcended to tell us that *Alpes* is uſed in the Gen. ſing. why did he not tell us that it is uſed likewiſe in the Accuſ. by *Juvenal* and the ſame *Lucan*, in the Abl. by *Ovid* and *Claudian!* Had he conſulted Mr. *Ruddiman's* Grammar, he would have ſeen this, *p.* 158. *n.* 78.

P. 4. l. 5. *Inſula & urbs, arbor, regio communiter* hæc *dant.*

Mr. *Johnſon*, and after him Mr. *Ruddiman*, have ſhewn, that *inſula* is comprehended under the Word *regio*, and therefore it ought not to have been mentioned here: Nay Mr. *Johnſon* calls the doing ſo by no better a Name than *meer Impertinence*: "The proper "Names of Iſlands (ſays he) taking their Gender from *terra*, as "Lands or Countries, not as Iſlands, and ſo one Rule ſerves for "both." Which I think this Author, who devoted himſelf to Brevity, ought the rather to have adverted to.

l. 6. *Quædam finis habent genus, aut vocis generalis*: And in the ſame Page, l. 11. *Quædam terminationis genus capiunt.*

This is ſo generally expreſſed, that I'm afraid the Learner ſhall not be much wiſer for it. For if under theſe *quædam*, many more are comprehended than are here mentioned, *viz. Saſon, cupreſſus, Londinum, Tibur*, (and he gives occaſion to think it is ſo, by his adding, *&c.* to theſe,) I'd gladly then know, how the Learner ſhall know them from others. Is *Lacedæmon* maſc. becauſe *Saſon* is ſo? Is *populus, buxus, laurus* maſc. becauſe *cupreſſus* is? If not, where is the Direction in this Rule? I can't diſmiſs this Line without another Remark upon theſe Words, *aut vocis generalis.* This is ſet down as an Exception from the general Rule, ——— *communiter hæc dant*; and yet theſe *voces generales*, as he mentions them here, and in the laſt Part of the Senſe of the Rule, *inſula, urbs, arbor* and *regio*, are all feminine alſo. And ſo the Meaning of his Rule will be this, That Names of Iſles, Towns, Trees and Countries, are commonly feminine, but ſome follow the Gender of their

their Termination, *i. e.* are feminine becauſe of the general Word under which they are comprehended. This is ſo much the more ridiculous to be mentioned here, becauſe the great Reaſon why theſe Words are commonly feminine, even when their Termination is otherwiſe, is the Reſpect that is had to theſe general Words.

l. 15. *Omnia tamen ſunt feminina, ſi intelligas voces generales,* inſula, urbs, arbor, regio.

This, if true, would make eaſy Work indeed: For at this rate, all Names of Countries, Towns and Trees may be made feminine, if the Speaker or Writer underſtand in his Mind (which is eaſily done) theſe general Words, which are all feminine: And conſequently, according to Mr. *Trotter*, one might ſay, *pulchra* or *apta Argos, Anxur impoſita ſaxis, dura robur, levis ſuber*, which yet no Author I know of ever ventured to do. Nay he might in the Accuſ. ſay, *duram roborem, levem ſuberem*: For if he uſe the feminine, he cannot ſay *robur* and *ſuber*, ſince if *robur* and *ſuber* can in any caſe leave off to be neuter, they muſt in that caſe leave off to have their Accuſative like their Nominative, as is obvious to the ſhalloweſt Comprehenſion.

And while I am upon this Rule, I can't forbear offering a Remark upon another compendious Grammar, intituled, *A ſhort Introduction to Grammar*, publiſhed at *Dub'in* 1728: For our Nation is not the only one peſter'd with theſe vain and trifling Compends. This Author, *p.* 11. ſays, "Proper Names of Countries and Cities "are Feminines: But Cities in *o* are Maſculines, Cities in *e* ſhort "are Neuters." What then muſt the Learner do with *Venuſta Sirmio* in *Catullus*, which *Johnſon* ſays he does not remember to have ſeen in the maſculine? What ſhall he do with *Caſtulo* and *Tarraco*, that are only found in the feminine in *Latin* Authors? *Narbo* too is uſed by *Martial* in the feminine, *Hippo* by *Pliny* in the feminine ſometimes, nay and in the neuter alſo, as likewiſe *Obulco*, as they are cited by *Johnſon*, *p.* 20. As for his other Rule, That Cities in *e* ſhort (he means, no doubt, of the third Declenſion) are Neuters: That does not always hold either, for *Virgil* and *Juvenal* uſe *Preneſte* in the feminine. Now, what Directions gives this Author to his Scholar as to theſe? Why, "the Genders (ſays he) of other "Words, which cannot be known by theſe Rules, will appear by "the Declenſion and Termination of the Nominative Caſes, or by "the *Latin* Rules." This the Reader at firſt View ſees is abſolutely falſe, as to the Nouns here ſpecified, with reſpect to Declenſion and Termination: Nor ſhall he be the wiſer by his *Latin* Rules, for, *p.* 84. he ſays, *Mas eſt urbs in o*: ur *autem neutrum eſt, ſic* er, &c.

This

This is commonly the Reſult of all thoſe Grammars the World has been peſter'd with, that pretend to teach much in little Bounds. For, beſides the Obſcurity ſuch affected Compends are generally attended with, they often give us Rules that in many things are directly falſe, and contrary to the Uſe of Authors, or are apt to miſlead us: And beſides, the Rules they give do not contain one half of what is neceſſary to be known by the Learner in the *Latin* Tongue; as particularly in this Rule, where Mr. *Trotter*, that he might cram two into one, and that a very compendious one too, has omitted *Marathon, Pharſalus, Abydos, Pontus, Canopus*, &c. *oleaſter, rhamnus, lotus, robur*; ſome of which as frequently, if not oftner, occur in Authors, than ſome of theſe he has mentioned.

l. 33. *Non flexum neutrum eſt: hoc flexa, inflexave dant* I.

Here too many Things are huddled together, and particularly Names of Letters, and Words materially placed, which are indeclinable by Accident, and therefore would have required a Rule by themſelves: But this muſt be allowed to Compendizers, who, affecting Brevity, are not much in pain whether they are diſtinct and perſpicuous or not. And this laſt Part of the Rule is quite out of its Place too: For there can be nothing more immethodical, than to bring in a Rule of Termination, as this is, among thoſe of Signification. All that can be offered in defence of it is, that the Author, treating of indeclinable Words, and moſt of theſe in *I* being ſuch, he was reſolved, for his beloved Brevity's ſake, to diſcuſs them all at once, whether declinable or indeclinable, though the former ſhould properly have come under another Claſs, and have been a Part of his 11th Rule, *Hoc* Y *dabit*, &c.

l. 35. *Hoc* pondo, gauſape, frit, git, *quibus nihil deeſt.*

This is not only very unaccurately ſaid, for they all want Declenſion, as he himſelf expreſly ſays in the Rule, but is wrong alſo on another account: For, not to mention *gauſape* and *cepe*, which are not ſo certain, *frit* and *git* want the plural, and perhaps ſome Caſes in the ſingular. *Vid. Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 115. *n.* 35, 36, 37.

l. 36. *Hoc* nil, nihil, inſtar, hir, volup *vel* volupe, aſtu.

Why does not Mr. *Trotter* bring in here *fas, nefas, epos*, which

are as much indeclinable, with reſpect to any Change made upon their Caſes, as *nil*, *hir*, *inſtar*, *&c.* ? If it be ſaid, that the former are defective in ſome of their Caſes ſing. and their whole plural; the ſame is equally true of the latter. 'Tis true, he hath theſe three among his Rules of Termination: But there is no more Reaſon for the one than the other. Mr. *Ruddiman* indeed hath omitted *fas*, *nefas* and *epos*, out of his Rules of Termination, and yet hath mentioned *melos*, *nepenthes*, *hippomanes* and *cacoëthes*, in the ſpecial Rules, though he makes theſe as much indeclinable as *fas*, *nefas*, *&c.* But (beſides that Mr. *Ruddiman*'s Fault will not juſtify that of another) it would appear he reckoned ſome Difference between them: For that *melos* is declined among ſome old Authors, he ſhews *p.* 126. *n.* 71. and it is probable he was of Opinion, that if there was occaſion for it, we might ſay, *Sanatus eſt Nepenthe*, *Liber ſum ab hoc cacoëthe*, &c. It is certain that *Pliny* uſes *cacoëthe* in the plural, as *Johnſon* proves; which Mr. *Trotter* has not adverted to, when he ſays, *p.* 7. that it wants the whole plural: And this hinders the Word from being abſolutely indeclinable, which cannot be ſaid of *fas*, *nefas* and *epos*.

P. 5. l. 12. *Dictio ſæpe genus vocis generalis adoptat.*
l. 13. *Ut hæc* amethyſtus, chryſopraſus, ſapphirus.

This is by far too general: For though the greateſt Part of theſe Nouns are feminine, yet there are ſome only maſculine, as *beryllus*, *carbunculus*, *ſmaragdus*, which *Voſſius* proves, *p.* 512, 513. If it ſhall be ſaid, that the general Rule of Termination will anſwer theſe: How ſhall the Learner know, but that it may as well anſwer the other?

l. 15. *Hæc* papyrus, biblus, nardus, byſſus, hyſſopus, crocus, *& alia quædam ſimilia*; *quia generalis vox* planta, *vel* herba, *eſt fem. gen.*

What means our Author here by *quædam* and *ſimilia*? I ſuppoſe not *Greek* Words, or Words of a *Greek* Original, but Names of Plants in *US*, which by their Termination would otherwiſe be maſculine. But ſince the greateſt Number of theſe, as Mr. *Ruddiman* has ſhown, at leaſt the moſt common, are maſculine, how ſhould the Learner diſtinguiſh them? Such general Rules as theſe are good for nothing. Mr. *Trotter* will pardon me, ſince he is ſo much upon the compendizing Lay, if I ſhall adviſe him, when he makes a ſecond Edition of his Grammar, to give us one general Rule for all,

viz.

viz. That all Words that are capable of being reduced under any one particular *genus* or *ſpecies*, as Logicians ſpeak, are of the Gender of that Word under which they are comprehended. This might have ſufficed for the reſt as well as here, and let the Scholar ſhift for the Exceptions as he beſt can. Elſewhere indeed he meets with ſome, but here none at all; or, which is the ſame thing, that will anſwer to no purpoſe. In the Senſe on this Rule, if he had pleaſed, he might have taken notice of *bubo*, uſed by *Virgil* in the feminine, becauſe of the general Word *avis*. Poſſibly I may gueſs at his Reaſon for omitting it; that he look'd upon it as a Word of the common Gender, and that *Virgil*, when he ſays *ſola bubo*, ſpoke of the Female. But as that can't be made out, ſo he has the beſt Grammarians againſt him, and particularly *Servius*, who ſays *Virgil* makes *bubo* there feminine becauſe of the general Word *avis*.

l. 21. Hadria *mas.*

It had not been amiſs, here or in the Senſe, to have told, as Mr. *Ruddiman* has done, that *Hadria* was only maſculine when taken for the Gulf of *Venice*, but feminine when taken for the Name of a Town in *Silius Italicus* and *Juſtin*.

l. 24. *Hoc* paſcha *tam primæ quàm tertiæ.*

This Addition of *tertiæ* is ridiculous, after that *Voſſius* has at great Length ſhown, that it is a Fault to uſe this Word in the third Declenſion. Would he have us to accept of his Authority preferable to that of *Voſſius*? He has alſo omitted to take notice here, that *talpa* and *dama* are ſometimes maſculine: But this is to be imputed to his general Fancy or Miſtake, that theſe and ſuch like Words are of the common Gender.

l. 34. *Hæc* halo, caro*que*.

He has here omitted *echo* for a *Sound*, unleſs he'll ſay, with *Nouvelle Methode*, that *echo* is feminine, becauſe, according to the Fable in *Ovid*, a Nymph ſo called was turned into a Voice or Sound: As if an *Echo* or reſounding of a Voice was not in the World before that Fable was invented. He may as well ſay, that there was not a *Laurel-tree* before *Daphne*, nor a *Loch-reed* before *Syrinx*: For ſo theſe Words ſignify in the *Greek*. See *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 16. *n.* 84. But his Omiſſion of *cupido* is ſtill more culpable, which is uſed maſculine by the Poets, not only for the *God of Love*, but alſo for *Luſt* or *Deſire*, as, *pravi cupidinis*, *ſordidus cupido*, in *Horace*. This was the rather to be noticed, becauſe in this laſt Senſe it is al-

ways uſed feminine by proſe Authors. But he was afraid, if he had ſtoopt to theſe Trifles, his Grammar had ſwell'd to a *portentoſa longitudo*. And for the ſame Reaſon it is, that he hath overlook'd *margo*'s being ſometimes uſed in the feminine by *Juvenal* and others: And yet in his Rule 21. he makes *colus* indifferently maſc. or fem. though there is only one Inſtance of its being maſc. from *Catullus*, *colum amictum*, which *Johnſon* owns is read in other Books *amictam*.

P. 7. l. 26. *Hic hæcve* dies.

That our Author has here omitted *palumbes*, muſt be allowed to his affected Brevity, which was not to take notice of ſmall Things, or Things not very uſual. But that cannot ſo well be ſaid of *ales*, which, as it is a very common Word, ſo it is very frequently uſed in both Genders. He'll ſay, no doubt, that it is originally an Adjective. But that will not anſwer his purpoſe: For how ſhall the Learner know its Gender when it is uſed as a Subſtantive? Will he ſay, that even then it may be uſed in any of the three Genders he pleaſes? For ſo as an Adjective it certainly may. If not, what is his Rule? Is it the Subſtantive which it reſpects? But even this will not do: For often, when ſpoke of *corvus*, *phœnix* or *pavo*, which are maſculine Words, it is uſed fem. and when it is uſed for *aquila*, which is feminine, it is either maſc. or fem. This Mr. *Ruddiman* has at great Length proved, and that more accurately than any before him, *Gr. maj. p.* 21. *n.* 13. It argues a good deal of Inadvertency, to have quite omitted this Word, after what is there ſaid: And if ſuch Words of the dubious Gender are to be omitted as theſe, I know not any worth noticing.

P. 8. l. 8. —— *ſimul* unguis & orbis.

Mugilis here omitted may be excuſed becauſe of his beloved Brevity, as being the ſame thing with *mugil*, mentioned above by him in his Rule for the Epicenes; but otherwiſe it had not been amiſs to mention it.

l. 19. *Gen. ſing.* foris, *Abl.* fore, *à Naminativo penè obſoleto* foris.

Why has Mr. *Trotter* omitted here *forem* in the Accuſ. eſpecially it being the moſt uſual Caſe of this Word in the ſingular Number with *Cicero*, as alſo *Livy*, *Forem virga percuteret*, vi. 34. *Forem ex ade Lunæ raptam tulit*, xl. 2. beſides *Plautus*, *Catullus*, *Ovid* and *Varro*, quoted by Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Gr. maj. p.* 159. *n.* 81.? And the

e Nominative *foris* is alſo uſed by *Plautus* and *Terence*, *Crepuit ris.* All which he might have ſeen in *Voſſius*, and Mr. *Ruddiman's* arger Grammar.

l. 24. & 25. Torques & delphis.

Both theſe, being very rare and unuſual, might have been ſpared y our Author, who is ſo much upon the epitomizing Lay.

l. 29. —— *Sic hæc ſata* phthongos, odos *dant.*

Theſe Nouns here mentioned would more properly have come nder the Termination *US*, in which the *Latins* moſt commonly, nd ſome always, uſe them.

P. 9. l. 6. —— *Dant hæc* manus, alvus, acuſque, Porticus *hæc*, ficus.

It is not here diſtinguiſhed, whether it be *acus*, *-ûs*, or *acus*, *-i*, the rſt being only feminine. Neither is it noticed here, whether *ficus* taken for the *Tree*, the *Fruit*, or a *Diſeaſe*; this laſt being ſuppoed to be maſculine, at leaſt *Voſſius* thinks it ſafe to uſe it ſo.

l. 8. *Hic* colus *hæcve.* ——

Colus, as was before obſerved, is made here indifferently maſc. or m. though there is but one Inſtance of the former, and that very ncertain too. The ſame may be ſaid of *atomus*, which Mr. *Trotter* this Rule makes alſo indifferently maſc. or fem. which in *Cicero* nd others is always uſed feminine, and maſculine only by *Vitruvius* nd *Lactantius*, as quoted by Mr. *Ruddiman*; but neither of theſe re reckoned ſtandard Writers of the *Latin* Tongue.

l. 29. *Hæc dant à* juvenis ſervuſque *abſtracta.* —

Servitus is not an Abſtract from *ſervus*, as our Author here ſays, ut a Verbal from *ſervio*, Supine *ſervitum*: And this is not hindred om the Difference of Quantity, no more than *ambitus* the Subantive, from the Participle *ambitus.*

P. 10. l. 8. Seps, anguis.

Theſe ſhould have been put among the Exceptions of the Epicenes, alſo *ſerpens* of the doubtful Gender, the Gender of which laſt is t taken notice of by him any where. He ſhould have likewiſe obſerved,

ſerved, that *rudens* is moſt frequently maſculine. And he has quite omitted *animans*, which is ſometimes uſed maſc. but more frequently in the fem. or neuter.

l. 27. *At in* AX *&* *in* EX *polyſyllaba dant* hic.

Why has not Mr. *Trotter* mentioned here *halex* or *alex* in his Exception from this Rule? Perhaps, as it is commonly uſed for a Herring, he takes it for an Epicene: But then, as it is a Polyſyllable in *EX*, it ſhould be maſc. by the Rule here; and therefore, as it is notwithſtanding fem. it ſhould have been noted as ſuch, either here or among his Epicenes. But I'd gladly know, under what Rule he brings it, when it more frequently ſignifies a *Pickle* for Fiſh-ſauce and then is always fem. I'm ſure in that Senſe it can have nothing to do with his Epicenes.

l. 30. *Hic* fornix, varix*que*.

Mr. *Trotter* has blindly here followed *Deſpauter* and others: But had he conſidered the Authorities brought by Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Gr. maj. p.* 40. *n.* 13. upon the Word *varix*, he would have found it of the doubtful Gender, and that the Authority for the feminine is as good as that for the maſculine, *Seneca*, *Celſus* and *Quinctilian* having uſed it in that Gender, as is ſhown by him there.

Our Author too hath quite omitted here *calyx*, the Bud of a Flower. It would appear, for his beloved Brevity's ſake, he would have the *calix* mentioned in the Rule to ſtand for both: For though their Significations are quite different, yet their Sounds are ſo near to one another, that with Boys, who are not very nice, they may paſs for one and the ſame Word, at leaſt that the Gender of the one may give a Hint to that of the other. This is the more probable Conjecture, that in his Senſe of the Rule, and Liſt of Examples *p.* 112. he hath ſet down both.

He has likewiſe omitted in this Rule, *hyſtrix*, *limax*, *lynx* and *perdix*, all of the dubious Gender. But he'll no doubt ſay, that they are of the common Gender, and never uſed maſc. but when the Male is ſignified. But that is impoſſible to be proved; nay the contrary ſeems evidently certain: For it is not to be thought, that when *Horace* ſays, *timidos lyncas*, and *Columella*, *implicitus conchis limax*, they meant the male ones only. So far from that, that every body that conſiders the Matter will be perſuaded, that the Authors had no View to the Difference of their Sex at all.

l. 33. *Hic*, *rarò hæc* —— tradux, —— grex.

'Tis not eaſy to find, how our Author, in his ſhort Compend, ame to mention *tradux* and *grex* being ſometimes feminine, when e has omitted to take notice of *margo*'s being ſo. This is an In- ance of this Author's great Diſconformity with himſelf; and the ore remarkable it is, with reſpect to *tradux*, that it never occurs the Authors Boys are taught at School, but *margo* occurs very equently.

l. 34. *Hoc* atriplex *dabit, haud hæc.* And in his enſe thereon, Atriplex *potius neutrum, quàm femi- inum.*

Our Author appears to have been napping when he wrote this, r his Rule plainly contradicts his Senſe. In the former he poſi- vely affirms, that *atriplex* is never feminine; in the latter he ſays, at it is rather of the neuter than feminine, *i. e.* it is ſometimes fe- inine, but not ſo often as neuter. But after all his Poſitiveneſs, r. *Ruddiman, Gr. maj. p.* 41. *n.* 19. aſſures us, that all our mo- rn Writers of Phyſick and Botany uſe this Word in the feminine. or Proof of this, the Reader may ſee *Pharmacopœia Edinb.* where, 4. he'll find *atriplex fœtida, atriplex ſativa*, reſpecting, no doubt, e general Word *herba*; and that notwithſtanding the Authority *Pliny*, who uſes it in the neuter, which ſeems to have ſomething range in it as to this Particular.

P. 11. l. 15. Dicis *ſolus eſt Genitivus, ab obſoleto om.* dex.

Why not rather *dix?* for from *dex*, *decis* would rather follow an *dicis*. But it is more probable it comes from neither, but from e *Greek* Word *Νὺξ*. See *Voſſius de Analog.* i. 47.

l. 20. *In Nom. & Voc. ſing. rarò reperitur* nex.

The ſole Authority of *Cicero*, uſing this Word in the Nom. *in- ſta nex*, ſuppoſe we had not *Quinctilian*'s alſo, and others quoted y *Ruddiman, p.* 132. is ſufficient for our uſing it in the ſame Caſe hen Occaſion ſerves.

l. 27. Codicilli, &c.

The Plurals here mentioned by our Author, maſc. fem. and neut. re jumbled together without any Order. Had they been put into erſe, that would have excuſed it; and I doubt not but it would have

have been troubleſome enough: But as they are not, he ought t
have ranged them at leaſt alphabetically.

Ibid. & p. 12.

In theſe Liſts there are ſome Words that might have been ſpar
in a Compend; ſuch as, *induvia*, *parietina*, *offucia*, *affania*, ſeei
they rarely occur: But this might eaſily be excuſed, if other Word
that are more frequent, had not been quite omitted, as, *faſces*, maſ
tenebræ, *lactes*, *decima*, fem. *principia*, *bona*, *mœnia* and *brevia*
neut. not to mention *facultates*, *fortunæ*, *literæ* and *ædes*, which h
will ſay are ſometimes uſed ſing. in that Signification. It may in
deed be ſaid, that *lactes* is not very common, that *decima* is uſe
ſometimes in the ſing. and *principia* and *bona* are moſt frequent i
the ſing. But *lactes* is common enough among Phyſicians and Na
tural Hiſtorians; *decima* is very common, and rarely ſing. *princip*
and *bona* never in that Senſe. But what will he ſay to *tenebræ* an
mœnia, than which none are more common? not to mention *fa*
ſces and *brevia*, the firſt of which is very common, and the oth
not unfrequent, and neither of them uſed in the ſing. in that Signi
fication. Beſides, if being uſed in the ſing. were ſufficient to ex
clude them, then ſeveral of theſe mentioned by him might likewi
be excluded; as, *cani*, *ſuperi*, *inferi*, *poſteri*, *faſti*, *diræ*, *operæ*, *fo*
riæ, *caſtra*, *luſtra*, *juſta*, *roſtra*. 'Tis a ſtrange Way of abridging
where the more unuſual Things are inſerted, and the moſt com
mon quite left out. As to his Tranſlation of *parapherna*, which
he makes to ſignify, *the Husband's Compliments to his Wife*, beſid
Dowry, the ſame is falſe. It was never much cuſtomary for Hus
bands to give their Wives Dowries, whatever Compliments the
may give them. But perhaps Mr. *Trotter* is for reviving *Solon*'s
Law, which ordered the Husbands to give their Wives Dowries
and not the Wives to their Husbands; which alſo the ancient bar
barous *Germans* practiſed, as *Tacitus* informs us: *Dotem non uxo*
marito, *ſed uxori maritus offert*. Be that as it will, *parapherna* ſi
gnifies, *the Things the Wife brings her Husband beſides the Dowry*
And this is very certain from the very Derivation of the Word, *παρὰ φέρνη*, hoc eſt, *ea quæ uxor*, *præter dotem*, *ad virum defert*.

P. 12. l. penult. *Quædam unam dant, multa duas tres plurima fines.*

Not to mention the harſh Ecthlipſis in this Verſe, how came our
Author here to make *fines* of the fem. Gender? 'Tis true, *finis* is
ſometimes of this Gender in the ſing. but never, that I know of,

the plural. And it is the leſs excuſable here, that there was not the leaſt Neceſſity for it, ſince the Verſe would have run as well, had he ſaid *unum* and *duos*, as *unam* and *duas*. But the true Reaſon was, that he would not be beholden to Mr. *Ruddiman* in his Verſe Rules; though he has followed him very much in other Things. And it had been to the Advantage of his Book, that he had followed him much more: For he ſeldom leaves him, but he becomes erroneous or immethodical. And of this laſt Fault we have an Inſtance here, in the throwing the Genders of his Adjectives after thoſe of the Terminations, without telling us before, that he was only treating of the Genders of Subſtantives.

P. 13. l. 18. *In feminino ſingulariter* pleraque, *& forſan etiam neutro* plerumque, *abſque maſculino.*

Here again Mr. *Trotter*, that he might differ from Mr. *Ruddiman*, brings into his ſhort Compend what is very unuſual, *pleraque* and *plerumque* without the maſc. *Salluſt* indeed has once and again *pleraque nobilitas*, and, *pleraque Africa imperitabat*: But no good Author ſince that Time has uſed that Way of ſpeaking, except *Gellius*, who very much affected the antiquated Way, and uſes *pleraque* once or twice in the ſing. But then, if *Salluſt* is to be imitated in this, by the ſame Reaſon we may uſe alſo the maſculine: For ſo that Author, in *B. Jugurth. cap.* 54. *Exercitum plerumque in iiſdem locis opperiri jubet*, ſciz. *Jugurtha*. And *Cortius* plainly ſhews *plerumque* there to be an Adjective: *Plerumque* (ſays he upon this of *Salluſt*) *eſt adjectivum, ut rectè Ciacconius animadvertit; & ſic ſæpiſſime noſter*, Cat. cap. 23. cap. 38. & cap. 79.

l. 20. *Indeclinabilia, ſed integra ſunt* nequam, frugi.

Mr. *Trotter* again here deſerts Mr. *Ruddiman*, and thereby has gone wrong: For here he makes *frugi* an Adjective, and indeclinable, contrary to the Opinion of *Voſſius*, *Perizonius*, *Johnſon* and others; *homo frugi*, where *aptus* or *idoneus* is underſtood, being ſaid almoſt the ſame Way as *homo nauci, nihili, &c.* If the Reader has not theſe Authors at hand, he may conſult *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 113. *n.* 27. Mr. *Trotter* ought not to have impoſed ſuch Traſh upon the World again, without at leaſt refuting the weighty Reaſons offered by theſe great Men.

Mr. *Trotter* has alſo here omitted all the diſtributive Numbers, *ſinguli, bini, &c.* which generally want the plural, unleſs (which is almoſt only by the Poets) when they are uſed for the cardinal.

P. 14. l. 24. *Caſus eſt vocis, in declinando, terminatio.*

Here the Author gives us the Definition of a Caſe, but not of a Number.

l. 28. *Hi per* A *tres caſus plurales uſque leguntur.*

I ſhall not take notice here, that ſome of theſe want the plural, and conſequently are not always read in *A*: But even of theſe that are declined, there are two *Latin* Words, *ambo* and *duo*, and ſome *Greek* Words, that do not end their Neuters in *A*; and therefore Mr. *Ruddiman* very juſtly ſubjoined to the Rule on this Head, Ambo, duo, *at legem ſpernunt, & paucula Græca.*

P. 15. l. 13. *Vult* A *ſub fines.*

I take this to be an Error of the Preſs, for, *Vult* A *ſibi fines.*

l. 19. *Cum fit in* E *rectus, ſemper fit in* ES *Genitivus.*

This *ſemper* is too poſitive a Word; for ſeveral Words in *E* have their Gen. in *Æ* diphth. as, *Circæ, Penelopæ, Hecatæ.* Theſe indeed may come from their ancient Nominatives in *A*, but then ſuch a Rule is apt to deceive the Scholar.

l. 29. *Nomen in* ES, *aut* E, *dabit* EN *ſolummodo quarto.*

Our Author ſhould have ſaid *tantummodo*, which frequently occurs in the beſt Authors, as *Cicero*, *Horace* and others; but *ſolummodo*, though a common Word now, is not to be found in any good Author. But that is not all; for I much doubt if the Thing here ſaid is true: For among the great Number of theſe Nouns ending in *EM*, collected both by *Johnſon* and *Ruddiman*, and that from the beſt and moſt accurate Editions, it is hard to impute them all to the Printer or Publiſher.

P. 16. l. 32. ER *vel* IR, UR *fines*, &c.

This *vel* is brought in here to make the Syllable *ER* long; but then it is apt to miſlead the Scholar, as if Words in *ER* might alſo end in *IR*; as, when it is ſaid, that *Greek* Words of the firſt Declenſi-

on

on may have their Accuſative ſing. in *AM vel AN.* But there was no Need for it here: For (not to mention that Syllables, or ſimple Terminations, may perhaps be made of any Quantity, tho' the Words themſelves ſo terminated may have a different Quantity) it is ſufficient to juſtify the making the Termination *ER* here long, that there are two Words ſo ending in this Declenſion, which have that Syllable long, *viz. Iber* and *Celtiber*, though this laſt is not always ſo.

P. 19. l. 21. *Toto plurali carent hujus regulæ nomina, ſciz. compoſita à Græco* meli, *& finita in* Y; *ut & pleraque rerum omnium nomina, quæ menſurari aut ponderari ſolent; item pleraque herbarum & mineralium nomina.*

Not to mention, that ſuch Words as want the plural are brought in very aukwardly here, and that at leaſt he ſhould have given ſome Examples of them: I ſay, not to mention this, how comes he to omit ſeveral Names of other things, beſides theſe mentioned here, as *Abſtracts, Arts?* And eſpecially, how comes it that *Minerals* are mentioned, and *Metals* omitted? If he ſhall ſay, that they are comprehended *inter res quæ menſurari aut ponderari ſolent*, this will hold of the one as well as the other. If he ſay, that he chiefly regarded thoſe of this Declenſion; then where are Words of this kind wanting the plural of other Declenſions, and particularly of the ſecond, taken notice of? And even of this, *chalybs* the Metal is omitted; which Word is no where, when taken for Metal, found plural.

P. 20. l. 21. —— MEN & EN *dat* inis *quoque neutrum.*

Here Mr. *Trotter* has tranſgreſſed his own Rule of Brevity, by making three Verſes for two of *Deſpauter*, and Mr. *Ruddiman* from him, to find the Genitive of Nouns in *N*; and that without any Neceſſity, unleſs he will ſay, that the Learner could not know theſe Words derived from *cano*, unleſs he had added, that they end in *CEN*: For which there was no Need to a Boy of any tolerable Capacity, ſince that would have appeared ſufficiently from the Examples. But what is the Uſe of both *MEN* and *EN* here? Do not all Wods in *MEN* end in *EN*?

P. 21. l. 28. *Dant* antis *maſcula Græca.*

Why are neuter *Greek* Words here in *AS* omitted in the Rule, and

yet brought in by him in the Senſe? How ſhall the Learner answer to, *Tange partem regula*, for ſuch?

P. 22. l. 14. *At* teges tegetis, &c.

What is the Meaning of this *at*? One would think, that as it immediately follows after *Greek* diſſyllable Words in *ES*, that *teges*, *prapes*, *&c.* are alſo *Greek* Words, and differ only from the former in the Quantity of their Genitive.

l. 20. *Dant* idis *à* ſedeo, *finita in* SES, *tamen orta.*

The ſame Objection lies againſt this *tamen*. For the plain Meaning is, that notwithſtanding that moſt Nouns in this Rule are Exceptions from the general Rule, ES *mutatur in* IS; yet *obſes*, *deſes*, *&c.* are no Exceptions from it. If ſo, then they ought to have *obſis*, *deſis*, *&c.* in their Genitive; when yet at the ſame time he tells you, they have their Genitive in *idis*; which differs as far from that of the general Rule, as almoſt any other mentioned.

l. 29. *Genitivo*, *Dat.* & *Abl. plurali*, *aut fortè toto carent*, ſoboles, proles, indoles, labes.

This *aut fortè*, ſignifies, I ſuppoſe, *for ought he knew*. But had our Author peruſed *Voſſius*, *Johnſon* or *Ruddiman*, which he ought to have done, they would have ſhewed him, that all of them are found in the plural, and moſt of them in very good Authors, if *Lucretius*, *Cicero*, *Pliny* and others there quoted by them, are to be reckoned ſuch; but indeed it is but rarely. And this is the more remarkable, that he is poſitive that *tabes*, *lues* and *quies*, want the plural wholly; *Toto plurali carent*, ſays he, ſpeaking of theſe three laſt Words: And yet two of theſe are uſed plurally by no leſs an Author than *Cicero* himſelf, not to mention others. He might have cauſed his *fortè* equally anſwer for all; for though *tabes* is not yet found in the plural, who knows but *fortè* it may?

P. 23. l. 14. *Toto plurali carent* bilis, pulvis.

This is a Miſtake: For *pulvis* hath the plural in *Horace*, *Epod.* xvii. 48. *Novendiales diſſipare pulveres*. And *bilis* alſo, when taken for a Diſeaſe, is uſed by *Pliny* in the plural, as *Johnſon* and *Ruddiman* ſhow.

l. 27. Os *facit* oſſis, Os oris.

It was not without Reaſon that *Deſpauter*, and after him Mr. *Kirkwood*

wood and Mr. *Ruddiman*, have it, *Oſſis os optat, Os oris*, that the Diſtinction betwixt theſe two Words may appear by the Difference of their Quantity; which is not to be ſeen, as Mr. *Trotter* has altered it.

P. 25. l. 1. Orpheus, *Gen.* Orpheos, —— *Voc.* Orpheu, *at abſque Ablativo.*

He ſhould have added, *in hac declinatione.* So little has our Author ſtudied Perſpicuity.

In *p.* 27. he has omitted *Greek* Words in *YS* from his 45th Rule, concerning the Ablative ſing. but takes them in in his Senſe.

P. 28. l. 24. *Vix gradus* i *medius, vix* i *dat mobile in* NS.

This is by far too ſtrongly, if not untruly, ſaid: For though the Termination *e* is more frequent, yet there are innumerable Examples of both theſe kinds of Adjectives in *i*; which cannot poſſibly agree with this *vix*. See *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 89. *n.* 97 *& ſeqq.*

l. 28. Our Author has omitted here all Adjectives that by Uſe have become Subſtantives, except Names of Months. Had theſe followed perpetually the Rule of their Adjectives, or were they otherwiſe Words that ſeldom occur, there might be ſome Excuſe for them; but as neither of theſe is true, the Omiſſion is therefore the more inexcuſable.

P. 29. l. 5. *Vult* ia *ſed neuter.*

What Grammarian or other Author ſaid, *Rectus pluralis neuter*, for, *Nominativus pluralis neutri generis?* And for the ſame Reaſon, though *mas pluralis* may paſs, I would not ſay however *muliris pluralis* or *rectus*. And it is the more faulty, that he uſes the ſame Way of ſpeaking in his Senſe, *Nominativus pluralis neuter.*

l. 30. *Si per* e *ſit ſextus, patrius pluralis in* um *fit.*

He ſhould certainly have ſaid *e tantùm*; for otherwiſe the Rule is falſe. And if he ſhall object, that *Deſpauter* and Mr. *Ruddiman* have fallen into the ſame Fault, by ſaying in the preceeding Rule, *Præbet um patrius ſi ſextus in* i *fuit ante*, without adding, *ſive* i *tantùm, ve* i *&* e *ſimul*, (which yet is done in both their Senſes;) there is great Difference between theſe: For the Meaning of this laſt is, that Words of this Declenſion that have *i* in their Ablative any manner

ner of way, have *ium* in their Genitive plural: But it cannot be ſaid, that Words of this Declenſion, that have *e* in their Ablative any manner of way, have *um* in their Genitive plural; for theſe that have ſometimes *e* and ſometimes *i*, have *e* ſome manner of way, and yet have not *um*, but *ium*. And this is the more remarkable, that in the preceeding Rule he has not ſo fully explained himſelf as he ought to have done, and the Proſe made it eaſy for him: But here he was in ſuch haſte, that inſtead of explaining himſelf, where it was abſolutely neceſſary he ſhould, he hath, contrary to his uſual Practice in reſuming in Proſe what he had ſaid in Verſe, done no more but given us an Example.

P. 30. l. 5. *Donat* ium ſamnis, linter, caro, dos, uter, os, lar.

He ſhould have told here what *os* he meant. But he'll anſwer, it muſt be *os oſſis*, for he had ſaid before that *os oris* wants the Genitive plural. But as he has diſperſed his irregular Nouns here and there in a very confuſed Manner, I doubt if Boys will much mind them.

l. 7. *Et, duo quæ claudunt, monoſyllaba, conſona,* ium *dant.*

It cannot eſcape the Reader's Obſervation, how perplexed a Sentence this is: But, to let that paſs, by what Authority does our Author here ſay *duo conſona*, for *duæ conſonantes?* He may as well ſay *duo vocalia*, for *duæ vocales*; for to both theſe *literæ* is underſtood. I know *Deſpauter* and ſome others uſe that Way of ſpeaking; but we want better Authority to ſupport what is ſo contrary to Analogy. There is another Fault here, *viz.* that he does not except *Greek* Words, as *lynx, gryps, Thrax, &c.* which have *um* not *ium*.

l. 20. Um *cum* cœlitibus, proceres, luceres, lemures *dant.*

He hath here omitted *furfures*, which hath only *um*, as alſo *opum, pecudum*. But he muſt be excuſed, becauſe of the Brevity he ſo much ſtudies.

P. 31. l. 32. Situs, [*Naſtineſs,*] *toto caret plurali.*

This is falſe; for *Ovid* ſays, *demptos Æſonis eſſe ſitus*, lib. 7. Met. ſpeaking

peaking of the Naſtineſs of *Æſon*'s old Age, which *Medea* had ta-
en away.

P. 33. l. 16. Romulides.

I ſhould be glad to know, where our Author met with this Word
the ſingular; I much doubt if he can produce one Authority for it.
Our Author in this Page uſes the Word *inſtar*, four Times in as
any Lines, as if it were an Adverb, *inſtar Anchiſes*, *inſtar lampas*,
c. notwithſtanding that *Voſſius* has ſhown it to be a Subſtantive,
aving the Nom. and Accuſ. ſing. and he himſelf ſays ſo too *p.* 4.

P. 34. l. 10 & 11.

He hath here taken in among his Verbals the Terminations *US*
nd *NS*, in which the Words that ſo end are commonly called Par-
iciples, and never Verbals, but when they leave off to ſignify Time.
ut why has he omitted the Termination *AX*, which is as common
s any almoſt he has mentioned?

P. 35. l. 12. *Hæc* agilis, facilis, &c. Imbecillus
em dant illimus. *And in his Senſe*, agilis, agillimus.

This Superlative *agillimus*, *Johnſon* and *Ruddiman* ſhow, is with-
ut Authority. And then he miſtakes too in forming *imbecillimus*
om *imbecillus*; he ſhould have ſaid *imbecillis*: And *imbecilliſſimus*
eing alſo found, moſt probably comes from *imbecillus*.

l. 14. Superus, ſummus*que* ſupremus.

No good Author writes ſo, where the enclitic *que* is to be joined
the following Word, for *ſummus ſupremuſque*: For, as it is here
orded, one would think that *ſupremus* is the Poſitive, and *ſuperus*
nd *ſummus* two different Superlatives. *At id prorſus ineptum*, ſays
Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Gr. maj. p.* 324. *n.* 9. *cùm enclitica, priori vocum
r copulam jungendarum, nullâ aliâ interveniente, apponitur.* The
eader may there conſult Mr. *Ruddiman*, and the Authors there
uoted by him. The ſame Miſtake occurs in Mr. *Trotter*'s Gram-
ar, *p.* 41. *l.* 21. *nataque* vaſum, for *nata* vaſum*que*; *p.* 42. *l.* 25.
unxi *dant nataque* punctum, for *nata* punctum*que*; and there is
n idle Repetition of the *punctum* too in this Line; *p.* 43. *l.* 23. *a-
umque altum*, for *alitum altumque*; *p.* 71. *l.* 32. æqui*que* boni
at, for æqui boni*que dat*; *p.* 87. *l.* 25. ohe*que* Diana, for Diana
he*que*, or ohe Diana*que*: In all which the *que* is miſplaced.

l. 25.

l. 25. He hath omitted in this Rule to take notice of *ſiniſter* m king *ſiniſterior*. He had much better have omitted Words in *loqu* having *entior* and *entiſſimus*, becauſe there are no Examples of ſuch or of any Comparative or Superlative of them, now to be found *Plautus* indeed has a regular Comparative of two of them, *menda loquius* and *confidentiloquius*: But, as Mr. *Ruddiman* obſerves, the ſeem to be Words of his own making, as is uſual with that Author to ſhow his comical Wit; and not to be imitated (unleſs on the like Occaſion) by others.

P. 36. l. 11. *Hæc ſuperante carent*, ſatur, &c.

The Author has here omitted *pronus*, though otherwiſe a Wor pretty frequent; but he muſt be excuſed, becauſe his Verſe had no Room for it.

l. 19. *Pauca gradus in* UUS, *nullos in* EUS, *ve* IUS *dant*.

What is faulty here is, that the Author makes ſuch a particula Diſtinction between Words in *UUS* and *IUS*: For as there are great Number of Adjectives in *UUS* that admit not of this Manne of Compariſon, as *ambiguus*, *conſpicuus*, *congruus*, *contiguus*, *f tuus*, *ingenuus*, *innocuus*, *irriguus*, *perſpicuus*, *præcipuus*, *promiſcu viguus*, *ſuperfluus*, *viduus*; ſo there are ſeveral Words in *IUS* th are found thus compared, as *egregius*, *induſtrius*, *innoxius*, *luxuri pius*, *noxius* or *obnoxius*.

P. 37. l. 2. *De verborum præteritis & ſupinis.*

Here this Author falls at the rights to the Preterites and Supin of Verbs, without giving a Deſcription of a Verb, or any of its A cidents. However immethodical this is, yet I paſs it, becauſe th is done in the Rudiments: But then, why did he not the ſame wi reſpect to a Noun? See Animadverſions upon *p.* 2. of his Gra mar.

l. 14. Poto *magis* potum.

Magis than what? He will ſay, than *potatum*, according to th general Rule. Men may underſtand this, but Boys will not ſo ea ly take it up.

Ibid. *Vix bene* jutum.

This is true of the ſimple; but what becomes of the Compound *adjuvo*, which may very well have the Supine *adjutum*? And yet by his general Rule, That Compounds are conjugated as their Simples, *adjuvo* ought to want its Supine as well as *juvo*. It is one very remarkable Excellence of Mr. *Ruddiman*'s Grammar, that in the Senſe under every Rule concerning Verbs, Boys are at once ſhown how their Compounds are conjugated, and every thing neceſſary to be known relating to their Preterites and Supines, as they are uſed in the beſt Authors; which is very rarely done by Mr. *Trotter*.

l. 22. Mico *vult* micui, *nihil ultra.*

One would imagine, as this is worded, that *mico* had nothing beyond the Preterite of the Indicative: And if ſo, it would be a very defective Verb indeed. But as he is ſpeaking of Preterites and Supines only, I ſhall let it paſs.

l. 27. *Sed magis* AVI, ATUM neco *vult.*

I again here ſay, *magis* than what? He means, no doubt, than *UI CTUM.* But that is only to be gathered from *frico* and *ſeco*'s being ſo conjugated. Beſides, *nectum* is not now to be found in any good Author, as Mr. *Ruddiman* and others aſſure us.

P. 38. l. 12. *At vel* UI, *vel* PSI, ſorptum, *aiant* ſorbeo *nata.*

This Rule is falſe; for all the Compounds of *ſorbeo* have *ſorbui* only in the Preterite. *Abſorpſi* indeed is once to be found, and that in *Lucan*: *Abſorpſit penitus rupes.* But, in the Opinion of *Caper*, quoted by *Voſſius*, *Lucan* is not to be imitated in this.

l. 16. *Dat* doceo doctum.

What meant our Author, when treating of Verbs ending in *CEO* in this Rule, to omit the acquainting the Learner, that *arceo* wanted the Supine, and its Compounds had it? And as little is there told of *taceo*'s having the Supine, and its Compounds wanting it. Sure this was neceſſary even in a Compend.

l. 21. DI ſedit ESSUM.

That is, the Preterite *ſedi* gives *ſedi* for its Preterite. But poſ-

ſibly

ſibly this is an Error of the Printer, for *ſedet*, which alſo the Quantity requires.

In this Rule too, which concerns Verbs in *DEO* of the ſecond Conjugation, there is not one Syllable, nor through all his Rules, of *tondeo, totondi tonſum.* The great Haſte he was in, and his affected Brevity, made him eaſily overlook ſuch a Trifle, as if there had been no ſuch Word in the *Latin* Tongue.

P. 39. l. 13. Polleo *præteritis* ſileoq;, *carentq; ſupinis.*

How came Mr. *Trotter* to ſay, that *ſileo* wants the Preterite? *Lucan* has it thrice:

Lib. i. 277. *Sed poſtquam leges bello ſiluere coactæ,*
Pellimur è patriis laribus.
Lib. ii. 696. ——— *pavidi claſſis ſiluere magiſtri.*
Lib. v. 113. ——— *quàm Delphica ſedes*
Quòd ſiluit.

But, leſt it ſhould be thought that *Lucan*'s Authority is not ſufficient, *Caper* having rejected it with reſpect to *abſorpſi*, we have alſo that of *Ovid:*

Met. iv. 274. *Poſcitur Alcithoë, poſtquam ſiluere ſorores.*

And *Seneca*, Med. ỳ. 627.

Reſtitit torrens, ſiluere venti.

And, to crown all, *Cicero* himſelf, *Orat. poſt redit. in Senatu, cap.* 2. *Nunquam de me ſiluiſtis.*

l. 27. Abſtineo, attineo *nil præter* UI *modò poſcunt.*

This appears to be too far ſaid with reſpect to *abſtineo:* For the old Lawyers, as *Voſſius* and *Ruddiman* inform us, uſe *abſtentus*; and their Authority is by no means to be rejected in ſuch Things as theſe.

l. 30. Torqueo *ſemper habet* torſi, tortum*que ſupino.*

What is the Uſe of *ſemper* here? Had it ever another Preterite? Or was he afraid his Boys would go wrong, unleſs he tied them down by this *ſemper?* Beſides, one would be apt to think by his Way of wording it, that this *torſi* was not the Preterite, but the Supine.

P. 40.

P. 40. l. 17. *Dant* & ITUM coalet, latet, &c.

Why has he omitted here to inform the Learner, that the Compounds of *lateo* want the Supine?

P. 41. l. 19. SI SUM *dant* claudo, *ſic* rado, rodo*que* plaudo.

If this Gingle was affected, 'tis ſo much the more faulty, that theſe Monkiſh Rhimes are now every where condemned by the beſt Judges.

l. 26. *Nil capiet* fido.

This is falſe; for *Columella*, whoſe Authority is indiſputable, as having flouriſhed in the Reign of *Claudius Cæſar*, has it expreſly, as *Voſſius* and *Ruddiman* have remarked.

P. 42. l. 26. Pango*que* panxi, & pepigi, pactum.

This too is falſe: For *pango* has only *panxi*; for *pepigi* comes from the obſolete Verb *pago*. *Ineptè docent* (ſays *Voſſius*) pango *in præterito facere* pepigi & panxi, *cùm tantùm habeat* panxi: And afterwards, *Quare* pepigi *non à* pango *eſt, ſed à* pago. Of this Opinion are likewiſe *Johnſon* and *Ruddiman*. This Author miſtakes alſo in tranſlating *pango*, in the End of his Grammar, *p.* 127. and making it to ſignify *to ſing*. But that it ever ſignifies *to ſing*, ſays *Johnſon*, there is no Authority: For, although it be uſed of Compoſitions in Verſe, as, *Ego mira poëmata pango*, Hor. de Art. as it is alſo uſed of Compoſitions in Proſe, as he there ſhews from *Cicero*; yet, continues he, that is with reſpect to the compoſing or putting together, or the Manner of writing in thoſe Days.

P. 43. l. 13. Quatio*que vult* quaſſi, quaſſum.

There is no Authority for *quaſſi*, as *Voſſius* and *Ruddiman* have obſerved. In his Senſe he paſſes over *quatio* altogether, and tells us of the Formation of its Compounds; by which one would think he meant, that the whole Verb *quatio* was obſolete.

P. 44. l. 12. Cerno *vix* crevi, cretum.

This is too poſitively aſſerted, and taken in general not true: For *crevi*, taken for *decrevi* or *conſtitui*, is uſed by *Cicero* himſelf; and for *entring upon an Inheritance*, it is frequently uſed by the ancient

Lawyers, and ſometimes alſo by *Cicero*, and is the principal Term for that purpoſe. See *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 250. *n.* 51.

P. 45. l. 13. Pinſum, piſtum*que ſupino.*

Why did this Author omit *pinſitum*, for which the Authority is as good, as any for the other two?

P. 46. l. 19. Cambio PSI campſum.

Since our Author is ſo much for Brevity, he might have ſpared the Preterite here, there being no Authority for it, as both *Johnſon* and *Ruddiman* aſſure us: And as for the Supine *campſum*, there is little more than a Conjecture for it.

In like manner he might have ſpared, in the following Rule, rauſi *dat* raucio. For *raucio rauſi* ſimple is hardly found, ſays *Johnſon*: And for the Compound, *irrauſerit*, in *Cicero*, Mr. *Ruddiman* tells us the better Editions have *irraucuerit*; which, ſays he, may be derived from *rauceo*, of the ſecond Conjugation.

P. 47. l. 5. Geſtio *cum* glocio, &c.

Proſilio is omitted in t[illegible]Rule, though *glocio* and *dementio*, which are leſs frequent, are tak[illegible]notice of.

l. 23. *Vult* labor lapſus, &c.

This Author has likewiſe omitted in this Rule, *apiſcor aptus*. But though he may alledge that it rarely occurs, which is not altogether true either, yet ſure that cannot be ſaid for *adipiſcor adeptus*; for which there is not a Rule in this Grammar.

P. 49. l. 1. A *præſentis, licet in præterito mutetur, in ſupino tamen nuſquam mutatur.*

What is the Meaning of this *nuſquam*? Has this *A* more Places in the Supine than one, *viz.* the penult? But he'll perhaps ſay, that this *A* may be in the antepenult or other Syllables, as the firſt in *amatum*, *placitum*, *ſtatutum*, *amictum*, *&c.* But who ever dream'd that *A* in theſe Places, which generally makes up an eſſential Part of the Verb, and is very ſeldom changed even in the Preterite, was to be changed in the Supine?

P. 51. l. 15. Aceo, acui; acuo, acui.

Though

Though Mr. *Trotter* is very full in what goes before, as to Verbs coinciding in their preſent Tenſe, and differing in their Conjugation; yet here he gives but one Example of Verbs coinciding in their Preterite, as in *l.* 17. he gives but one of Verbs coinciding in their Supine; leaving it, no doubt, to Practice to find out the reſt. I take the Caſe to have been, that when he was making up Liſts alſo of theſe, he dream'd he had plunged himſelf into a *portentoſa longitudo*, and when he awoke, he threw aſide his Pen.

P. 56. l. 23. *Eodem quoque modo, cùm intercedunt alium verborum participia, quæ* (*ea*, I think he ſhould have ſaid) *cum ſubſtantivis, diverſi etiam generis, utrinque concordant : ut*, Grande moræ pretium, tuta futura via eſt.

This Example does not ſeem to ſerve his purpoſe: For the Senſe is not, *Tua tuta via eſt futura grande moræ pretium*; but, *Tua via eſt futura tuta, quod erit grande moræ pretium.* Here is an Appoſition, not of two ſingle Words, but of two Sentences or Clauſes, as in *Quintilian, Cogitet Oratorem inſtitui, rem arduam*, i. e. *quæ eſt res ardua.* See *Rudd. Gr. maj. part.* 2. *p.* 5. *n.* 6, 7, 8.

In *p.* 57. our Author, who elſewhere affects to be very compendious, has not been ſparing in his Rules: For beſides the general Rule for the Relative, he has given us three additional ones, which perhaps might have done as well in Proſe. And yet in this ſame Page, when he tells us, that Interrogatives or Indefinites are comprehended under his 9th Rule, *Eſt verbo Referens rectus, ſi nil meditárit*, he gives no Example, though that is the very Life of Inſtruction.

P. 58. l. 17. SUM *varii rectis numeri poſt quadrat & ante.*

By this Rule, one would think, that what he ſays here was confined to the Verb *ſum* only. In his Senſe indeed he has taken in other ſubſtantive Verbs, and his firſt Example is one of them, and not *ſum*. But why has he omitted to mention other Verbs, ſuch as thoſe of *Calling* and *Geſture*, that have the ſame Property, as in *Salluſt, Poſſedere ea loca quæ Numidia appellatur*, where he might have ſaid *appellantur*; and in *Sil. Ital. Mœſto ſuffuſa lumina vultu, Feminæus matres graditur chorus.*

l. 21. *Quartus ubique modo præponitur infinito.*

This

This Rule is both ambiguouſly and falſely expreſſed; ambiguouſly, I ſay, for it may be ſo underſtood, as if the Accuſative were never uſed but before the Infinitive Mood: And if ſo, the Accuſative is never governed by an active Verb, or a Prepoſition. But as this cannot be his Meaning, we ſhall take it as our Author deſigned it, namely, That the Infinitive Mood always requires an Accuſative Caſe before it, either expreſſed or underſtood; for no leſs can this *ubique* ſignify: Then his Rule is falſe. The great *Voſſius* indeed and *Scioppius*, are of this Mind; but *Urſin*, and after him Mr. *Ruddiman*, have almoſt demonſtrated the contrary: For what Accuſative is underſtood in theſe, *Deſinas ineptire*, *Non poſſum pati*, *Qui volet eſſe pius*, and the like? Mr. *Trotter* will no doubt anſwer, That *me*, *te*, *ſe* and *illum* are underſtood, which may be known from the Perſon of the finite Verb. That this is true frequently, nay and theſe expreſſed ſometimes, is paſt all doubt: But then, that this ſhould always hold, theſe Authors ſhew to be contrary to all Reaſon and Analogy. And the Reader cannot miſs of ſeeing this very remarkable in the laſt Example: For if you add *ſe*, you muſt alſo ſay *pium*, and not *pius*. See *Rudd. Gr. maj. part.* 2. *p.* 12. *n.* 36.

l. 27. Here is quite left out that Rule ſet down by moſt Grammarians, *Eſſe pares optat caſus*. He'll anſwer probably, That it is comprehended under his 4th Rule, *Mobile concordat fixo*. Why did he not then give us a Hint of it there? But ſo far from that, that all his Examples there are of Verbs of the finite Mood. Not to mention, that it would have very aukwardly come in there, where he was treating of the Agreement of an Adjective with its Subſtantive, or of one Subſtantive with another; that gives no manner of Direction, what Caſe the principal Subſtantive is to be put in, whether Nominative, Accuſative or Dative: For I can ſay upon good Authority, *Cupio eſſe clemens*, *Cupio me eſſe clementem*, and *Licet mihi eſſe clementi* or *clementem*; which I'm ſure that Rule will never tell me. If it ſhall be ſaid, that theſe are Niceties of the *Latin* Tongue, and ſeldom occur; I dare be bold to affirm the contrary, and that they not only frequently occur, but create the Learner no ſmall Difficulty. One thing I'm ſure of, that they occur a hundred times oftner than Examples of the Antecedent's being included in the Poſſeſſive, on which however he has beſtowed a Rule *p.* 57. I ſhall not inſiſt upon that *Greek* Way, *Rettulit Ajax eſſe Jovis pronepos*, of which however there are as many Examples at leaſt, among good Authors, as of that laſt mentioned.

l. 28. *Plurales voces fixis nexu dato junctis.*

If this Rule is adapted to the Capacity of Learners, I'm much deceived: For had he not explained himſelf in his Senſe, not only Scholars, but even Maſters would have had Difficulty to underſtand him.

P. 59. l. 20. *Reſpondens rogitanſque ab eadem voce reguntur.*

But what if the Interrogative be of the Nominative Caſe? Then here it cannot be ſaid to be governed; as, *Quis herus eſt tibi? Amphitruo.*

P. 60. l. 7. *Hæc,* meus *atque* tuus, noſter, veſter*que* ſuus*que*,
Fixa regunt patrio, &c.

Of all the Syntactical Obſervations concerning Pronouns, which Mr. *Ruddiman* has been very particular upon, and which are moſt neceſſary to be known by every Scholar in the *Latin* Tongue, our Author here only takes notice of one, and that more unuſual than moſt of thoſe he has omitted.

P. 61. l. 6. *Mobile vult patrium verbale* ax, ivus & ns,
Neglectus, curæ, noxæ, integri, &c.

Here our Author has taken three Lines to a Rule, which Mr. *Ruddiman* has comprehended in two, and to better purpoſe too: But he would be more particular than any Grammarian before him in the Verſe Part, and among the reſt has brought in a Thing ſo unuſual, that Mr. *Ruddiman*, for all his *portentoſa longitudo*, has not thought fit to mention in his Small Grammar; I mean Words in *ivus*. And ſince he would bring it in, I could wiſh he had ſatisfied himſelf with the Example of it furniſhed him by Mr. *Ruddiman*, out of one of the old Lawyers, *Gr. maj. part.* 2. *p.* 75. and not impoſed upon the World, by quoting out of *Pliny*, into which *Deſpauter*, who has the ſame Example upon this Rule, had miſled him, *Cometes belli ſignificativus*: For *Pliny* has not ſo much as the Word *ſignificativus* in his whole Works now extant; and I much doubt if he ſhall find it in any Claſſical Author: And the old Lawyers can't be reckoned among them, though otherwiſe their Authority is not to be deſpiſed. And then, as to *mobile integri*, which he takes for *adjectivum innocentiæ*; tho' well he explains it ſo, for otherwiſe every body would not have underſtood it.

l. 21.

l. 21. *Pluralem patrium ſibi partitiva requirunt, Ejuſdem generis; niſi fixum diſcrepet antè.*

This is a ſtrange Affectation of Singularity, that, contrary to the Practice of moſt Grammarians, in the preceeding Rule he enumerates a great Number of the Adjectives comprehended under it where there was little or no Neceſſity; here, where the Thing ſeems more to require it, he hath quite omitted it. *Niſi fixum diſcrepet antè*: He means, That when the Subſtantive differs in Gender from the Genitive of Partition, in that caſe the Partitive ſhould agree with that Subſtantive. But this for the moſt part is ſo far from happening, that there is no other Subſtantive to be met with, but that of in the Genitive, as *nulla ſororum*. Beſides, the Thing is often otherwiſe, and ſo Analogy requires it ſhould be, (though the Cuſtom of Authors has often prevailed againſt it) as, *Laudatiſſima herbarum moly*.

P. 62. l. 18. *Regnavit populis agreſtibus.*

I doubt if this is *Latin*. *Cicero* indeed has, *Timarchidem omnibus oppidis regnâſſe*, *in* being underſtood. But there appears ſome Difference between *regnare in oppidis* and *regnare in populis*: I ſhould rather ſay with *Tacitus*, *Regnare in populos agreſtes*.

l. 35. *Alba tunc erat Latio caput.*

This Example, taken from *Florus*, to explain the Rule, Eſt mihi habeo, is very ill choſen; for *Latio* does not immediately depend upon *erat*, but on *caput*. See *Rudd. Gr. maj. part.* 2. *p.* 86. *n.* 1. *in fin.*

P. 63. l. 12. *Cuncta dabis terno, queis quidve ejus dicitur, aut fit.*

This is an ambiguous Way of ſpeaking; for *cuncta* here is ſo general, that it does not appear, whether Verbs or Nouns are underſtood by it: And one would think too, that *ternus* here were the Word governing, not the Word governed.

l. 31. Iraſcor votis, *id.*

One would think, that this *iraſcor votis* were in *Virgil*, the Author cited immediately before; whereas it is *Ovid's*, *Iraſcor votis heu levis ipſa meis.*

l. 3

l. 32. *At* aptus, ineptus, utilis, &c. *non ſolùm dativum, ſed etiam* AD *cum accuſ. ſæpe admittunt.*

This and the following Note deſerved particular Rules better than ſeveral others to which he has aſſigned ſuch Rules.

P. 64. l. 7. *Verba tamen pugnandi apud Poëtas tantùm conſtruuntur cum dativo.*

This *tantùm* is certainly ill placed: For one would think, as it here ſtands, Poets always conſtrued theſe Verbs with the Dative. But this is not true: For *Ovid* has, *Mollia pugnabant cum duris*, and, *Mecum certáſſe feretur.* He ſhould have ſaid, *apud Poëtas interdum*, or, which poſſibly he intended, *apud Poëtas, eoſque ſolum.*

l. 14. Offendo *accuſativum ſemper regit*; *ut*, Imparatum te offendam.

Our Author alſo is unhappy in the Choice of this Example: For *offendam* here is taken for *inveniam*, and ſo has nothing to do with this Rule, the Senſe being the ſame as in that of *Terence*, *Si in platea hac te offendero poſt unquam.* I wiſh he had rather kept by the Example furniſhed him by Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Cur ego amicum offendam in nugis?* But rather than be beholden to him, he would run the Risk of a Blunder.

l. 26. *Quædam tamen horum* (*nim. verborum quæ componuntur ex præpoſitionibus*, ante, ſub, inter, &c.) *accuſativum regunt.*

He ſpeaks of theſe Verbs as if their Number was very ſmall; and, which is ſtrange, notwithſtanding his affected Brevity, gives us two Examples of one and the ſame Verb with the Accuſative. Mr. *Johnſon* would have ſupplied him, if he had pleaſed, with ſome hundreds of Verbs compounded with theſe Prepoſitions governing the Accuſative: But, as he tells us afterwards, he leaves theſe to be learned by Practice. And indeed he might have left the greateſt Part of what he has ſaid to be learned that Way, or let what is ſaid in the Rudiments ſerve for all.

P. 65. l. 1. Caveo de te, *i. e.* cautionem do.

In the Liſt here given of Verbs variouſly conſtructed under a different

ferent Signification, though he had Mr. *Ruddiman* before him, from whom probably he has taken the moſt of it, as will be evident to any one that compares them; yet, that he might not act the Plagiary too openly, he has once and again inverted the alphabetical Order, in placing *auſculto* before *animadverto*, *ſufficere* before *ſolvo*, and made ſeveral other Alterations, by which he has gone wrong, as I hope to make appear in the following Animadverſions thereon. In the preſent Example, inſtead of *Cavere de re aliqua*, i. e. *cautionem dare*, which Mr. *Ruddiman* gives, and fortifies with good Authority from *Cæſar*, Mr. *Trotter* ſays *Caveo de te*, i. e. *cautionem do*. I hope this Author will not take it amiſs, that I require his Authority for this: For the *Caution* here given is generally, if not always, underſtood of a Thing, not a Perſon.

Conſulo tibi, *i. e.* conſilium do.

This *Vorſtius*, quoted by Mr. *Ruddiman*, ſays is not *Latin*; and Mr. *Ruddiman* joins him in that Matter, there being no Authority for it in any good Author.

Conſulo te, *i. e.* rogo.

Here our Author, inſtead of ſaying, with *Kirkwood* and *Ruddiman*, *Conſulo te*, i. e. *conſilium à te peto*, chuſes rather to ſay, *Conſulo te*, i. e. *rogo*; which does not anſwer that Phraſe, unleſs he had added *conſilium*: And even *rogo* with it is not ſo good as *peto*. This can be imputed to nothing but an affected Singularity.

Solvo tibi, *i. e.* rependo.

Here again is the Affectation: For *Solvo tibi* does not always ſignify *to repay*, as in *Solvere mercedem alicui*, *Solvere vota Deo*. We cannot ſay *Rependere mercedem* or *vota*, unleſs the Thing is done twice.

Tempero ſocios, *i. e.* rego.

Mr. *Trotter* would not ſay with Mr. *Ruddiman*, *Temperare orbem, ratem, vires*, leſt he might ſeem to have been indebted to him for his Examples. Inſtead of that, he has taken a Phraſe, which, for ought I know, never one uſed before him. *Cicero* indeed ſays, ſpeaking to *Verres*, whom he is there rating for his Avarice and Oppreſſion, *Te putet quiſquam, cum ab Italia freto disjunctus eſſes, ſociis temperáſſe?* But this, beſides that another Caſe is uſed, the Reader ſees is in a quite different Senſe from what Mr. *Trotter* intends.

Ibid.

Ibid. l. 35. *Dant patrium aut ternum* communis, par, proprius*que*.

It is ſcarce tolerable in an Abridger, to mention Things that are very rare and unuſual, and to omit Things that are pretty common, as our Author does here; who has quite neglected the Adjective *æqualis*, of whoſe Conſtruction with both theſe Caſes there are many Examples; and yet he has mentioned *par* and *fidus*, of which the Examples with the Genitive ſtand almoſt ſingle, and theſe moſt probably we have from Poets only.

l. 38. *Genitivum rariùs, dativum ſæpius regunt* communis, par, *&c.*

One would think, by the Author's placing *&c.* after *par*, that the Adjectives contained in this Rule were oftner joined with the Dative than the Genitive: Whereas *conſcius* oftner has the Genitive, and *communis, proprius, affinis* and *ſimilis*, are almoſt indifferently conſtrued with either, not to mention *alienus*, which has more frequently the Ablative with *à* or *ab*.

l. 40. Ille par tantæ dignitatis fuit. *Flor.*

I don't know what Edition of *Florus* our Author peruſed, when he made this Quotation from him. In the *Dauphin*'s Edition before me it is, *Sed ille quidem par tantæ calamitati fuit*, ſpeaking of *Regulus* made Priſoner by the *Carthaginians*; who, though the like had not happened to any *Roman* General before him, yet was he a Perſon of ſuch Reſolution, as to be able *to bear up under ſuch a Calamity*, and not to be diſpirited thereby. It is obvious, that *dignitatis* here muſt be oppoſite to the Hiſtorian's Purpoſe. If Mr. *Trotter* took this at ſecond hand, he was ſo far in the wrong; but much more ſo, to make choice of this for an Example, when Mr. *Ruddiman* had told, *Gr. maj. part.* 2. *p.* 88. *n.* 47. that both manuſcript and printed Copies of *Florus* were divided as to the Reading here, ſome having *calamitatis*, others *calamitati*; and that the greateſt Criticks, quoted by him, *viz. Heinſius, Salmaſius, Ryckius* and *Perizonius*, prefer *calamiti*; but not one Word of *dignitatis* there. He had much better then choſen, *Quem metuis, par hujus erat*, from *Lucan*, even though he ſhould have been indebted to Mr. *Ruddiman* for it.

l. 41. Ut par delicto ſit mea pœna meo. *Ovid.*

This again is wrong quoted; for he ſhould have ſaid *ſuo*, as it is in *Ovid's Triſt. l. 2. ỹ. ult.* But ſuch Trifles are to be excuſed to an Epitomizer, who is in haſte.

P. 66. l. 1. *Ex his quædam cum accuſ. vel abl. & præpoſitionibus conſtruuntur.*

He ſhould at leaſt have mentioned ſome of theſe *quædam*, and given an Example or two; for otherwiſe his Obſervations will make but little Impreſſion.

l. 10. *Verbis motûs, cujuſmodi ſunt* eo, curro, *&c. ſæpe ſubjungunt Poëtæ dativum, pro accuſ. & præpoſitione* ad *vel* in, *quomodo alibi ſemper conſtruuntur.* And in the Rule, *Queis aliàs* ad *cum quarto ſubjungitur aptè.*

Alibi here does not well quadrate with *Poëtæ* that went before. He ſhould rather have ſaid, *alii ea conſtruunt*, or *aliis ea conſtruuntur.* And the ſame Fault is in the Rule, if he takes *aliàs* for *alibi*, as he often does. But this is not all: *Quomodo alibi ſemper conſtruuntur*, ſays he; which is not univerſally true: For there are ſeveral Verbs that ſignify local Motion, which are often with Proſe Writers joined to a Dative, as, *Accidere genibus, Adequitare portæ, Adnare navibus, Advenire alicui, Antecedere alicui rei, Appropinquare Britanniæ*, as may be ſeen quoted by Mr. *Ruddiman.* If he ſay, that theſe and ſuch like are comprehended under his 29th Rule, *Verba regunt ternum nata* ante, &c. then he ought to have taken care not to contradict it, by aſſerting here the contrary.

l. 33. —— quoniam placet antè Dianæ. *Ovid.*

This Quotation is brought by our Author from *Ovid*, for illuſtrating the Rule, That Impersonal Verbs govern the Dative. It is in *Ovid's Epiſt. Acontius* to *Cydippe*; and it runs thus:

Quiſquis is eſt, placeat; quoniam placet antè Dianæ.

From which it plainly appears, that *placet* is here perſonal, not impersonal; and conſequently not to his purpoſe.

P. 67. l. 20. Me pedibus delectat claudere verſus. *Hor.*

It

It ſhould be *verba*; and ſo *Horace* has it, *Sat. l. 2. ſat. 1. ỳ. 28.* —— *me pedibus delectat claudere verba, Lucilî ritu* —— If our Author intended a Criticiſm upon *Horace*, I'm ſorry he is ſo unlucky: For *verſus* is ſcarce Senſe; for all Verſes are compoſed of Feet, otherwiſe they could not be Verſes.

l. 23. Oportet, & *verba quædam rogandi*; *item* ſino, *&c. cum ſubjunctivo, ſubaudito* ut, *eleganter conſtruuntur.*

This comes in here very abruptly, if not very impertinently; and ſhould have naturally come in, where he treats of the Conſtruction of the Conjunction *ut*, in his 76th Rule.

P. 68. l. 15. *Verba neutra accuſativum regunt cognatæ ſignificationis*; *ut*, Corydon ardebat Alexin. *Virg.*

This is downright Nonſenſe, unleſs our Author will ſay, that the Accuſative *Alexin* is of a cognate Signification with *ardebat*. Mr. *Trotter* has neglected in his Senſe the ſecond Line of his Rule, *Pro ſimul activis dant quartum neutra repoſta*, and has jumbled his Examples, ſo that it is not eaſy to tell, which of them he would have the two Branches of his Rule applied to.

l. 19. *Huc etiam à nonnullis refertur peculiare illud*, Inficias eo.

Some indeed do refer this Phraſe to this Rule, and, among the reſt, *Kirkwood* is very poſitive for it; but without Ground, for *ad* is here underſtood, as *Voſſius* has ſhown.

P. 70. l. 7. *In ablativo etiam ponitur materia.* —— *Interdum hic ablativus in genitivum convertitur*; *ut*, Argenti bifores valvæ.

This is ſcarce true, in the Way that the Matter of any Thing is underſtood to be conſtructed; for there ſome Verb or Participle, importing the making a Thing of ſuch and ſuch Materials, is either expreſſed or implied, as *facio*, *fabrico*, *ſtruo* and the like: Which will not anſwer that Notion here, where the Conſtruction is, *Biſores valvæ argenti radiabant limine*; and cannot be otherwiſe expreſſed, unleſs you add *factæ* or *fabricatæ*; for without theſe you cannot ſay *argento*

argento or *ex argento*, and when they are added, one cannot well ſay *argenti*. This he has borrowed from that trifling Grammarian Mr. *Watt*; and is alſo wrong on another account, for the beſt Editions have it, *Argenti bifores radiabant lumine valvæ*.

l. 19. *Poſt* alius, *apud Poëtas, præpoſitio interdum ſubauditur.*

Nay, for ought appears to the contrary, *alius* in this way of Conſtruction ſcarce ever has the Prepoſition added. The Reader, for further Satisfaction, may ſee *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 206. *n.* 18.

P. 71. l. 9. Solitæque cupidine cædis Utitur in pecudes.

In *Heinſius*'s Edition of *Ovid*, and in all other accurate ones, it is, *Vertitur in pecudes.*

l. 11. *Cum accuſativo etiam apud antiquiores hæc conſtruuntur verba, ſciz.* fungor, veſcor, &c.

Not only the more ancient, but even thoſe of the *Auguſtan* Age uſe *fungor* and *veſcor* with the Accuſative. This Mr. *Ruddiman* has ſhewn, *p.* 187. *n.* 56, 57. Mr. *Trotter*'s Citation for *veſcor* is from *Tibullus*, who lived in that Age; and if he imagines him to be among the more ancient, he errs much in point of Chronology.

l. 16. Ut gentium Roma potiretur.

Our Author here, without any introductory Senſe, falls at the rights to his Examples; which yet ſeem'd the more neceſſary, becauſe, according to his Rule, *At* potior *patrium, quartum regit atque Latinum*, one would think, that theſe three Caſes were abſolutely indifferent to *potior.*

l. 24. Longum ſexquipede, latum pede. *Plaut.*

He ſhould have ſaid *Plin.* for this Sentence is from him, *lib.* 35. *cap.* 14. Beſides, he ought to have made ſome Diſtinction as to the Adjectives of Meaſure governing the Accuſative and Ablative, the former being more frequent than the latter, as Mr. *Ruddiman* ſhows.

P. 73. l. 5. *Participans, ſimul atque ſupina, gerundia poſcunt.*

It is very incongruous *Latin*, to have *participans* in the ſingular, and *ſupina* and *gerundia* in the plural. This *ſimul atque* is alſo a little aukward, eſpecially as it ſtands after *participans*, and not betwixt *ſupina* and *gerundia*, where it ought to be.

l. 20. *Dat patrium aut quartum* pertæſus, *at uſque* peroſus, Exoſus *quartum.*

This Rule might have been ſpared; for *pertæſus* governs the Genitive by the Rule, *Adjectiva verbalia, affectionem animi ſignificantia*; and alſo becauſe *tædet* governs the Genitive: And when it governs the Accuſative, as in the Sentence quoted by the Author from *Suetonius*. *Pertæſus ignaviam ſuam*, *Perizonius* ſays, it is then taken paſſively, the Prepoſition *ob* being underſtood, *Pertæſus ſum ob ignaviam.* As for *exoſus* and *peroſus* governing the Accuſative, the Reaſon is, ſays Mr. *Ruddiman*, *p.* 226. *n.* 37., becauſe they ſignify actively.

l. 21. *Pluralem nunc genitivum In* DI, *pro quarto, rexere gerundia, caſu.*

One would imagine by this Rule, that Gerunds in *DI* of old governed the Accuſative, but now the Genitive plural inſtead of it. It is a ſtrange coupling of Times, to join *nunc* with *rexere* in the preterite Tenſe. He'll no doubt ſay, that *nunc* is here uſed for *interdum*, as he explains himſelf in the Senſe. This muſt be owned, when *nunc* is doubled, but never ſingly; or if it does, let him produce an Authority for it. The Reader, for further Satisfaction as to this Rule, may ſee *Rudd. Gr. maj. p.* 230. *n.* 54.

P. 75. l. 33. *Variari etiam poteſt ſupinum in* U *hoc modo*, Cognitu utilia, cognoſci, ad cognoſcendum, cognitione.

The Author here, ſpeaking of the Manner how the Supine in *U* may be varied, gives this Example, *Utilia cognitione.* He'll pleaſe give the Author where this Praſe is uſed: But he did not advert, while he followed Mr. *Ruddiman*, the Example brought there by him is, *Dignum cognitione*, not *Utile cognitione*, the former naturally governing the Ablative, but not ſo the latter.

P. 76. l. 13. *Huic enim, ſciz. ablativo comitatûs, ſæpe additur præpoſitio* CUM.

One

One would think by this Word *ſæpe*, that the Ablative of Concomitancy was oftner without than with the Prepoſition; which is not true. Mr. *Ruddiman* therefore more juſtly has it, *cui frequentiùs additur præpoſitio* CUM.

P. 79. l. 17. ABS *præponitur vocibus nonnunquam ab* R *incipientibus.*

This Mr. *Ruddiman* has ſhown not to be true, *p.* 316. *n.* 40. And for the common Phraſe, *Non abs re erit*, founded upon a Quotation from *Gellius*, he there ſhews from *Cellarius*, that ſeeing the Ancients conſtantly ſay *ab re*, the Reading in *Gellius* ought to be corrected.

P. 90. l. 16. Refert *à* res *producito natum.*

Perizonius has at great Length ſhewn, that *refert*, the impersonal Verb, is not compounded of *res*, as moſt Grammarians before him thought, but from the inſeparable Prepoſition *re*, and that notwithſtanding the Difference of the Quantity. See *Perizon.* in his third Note upon *Sanct. B.* 3. *ch.* 5. and *Rudd. Gr. maj. part.* 1. *p.* 277. *n.* 55. And our Author is the more inexcuſable in this, that in his Syntax, Rule 35. he makes *mea*, *tua*, *ſua*, *&c.* not the Abl. ſing. fem. as thoſe did who derived *refert* in this Senſe from *res*, but the Accuſ. plur. neut. which is contrary to all Analogy and Reaſon, if *refert* is formed from *res*. So that in this Matter, Mr. *Kirkwood* acted more conformable to himſelf than Mr. *Trotter* has done; tho' perhaps this is one of the *aniles nugæ* in Mr. *Kirkwood* and other Grammarians, which our Author, in his Preface, ſays gave him, amidſt his ſerious Thoughts, often much Diverſion and Sport.

P. 91. l. 30. *Corripe nata* fero, &c.

Ruo is here omitted by our Author, becauſe its Supine *ruitum*, I ſuppoſe, is not a diſſyllable Word. But as in its Compounds it is *rutum*, which is diſſyllable, it would have done as well to have brought it in among his Exceptions here, as to have placed it among the Polyſyllables in his Rule 15.

l. 36. *Præſens præterita & polyſyllaba, itemque ſupina, Menſuræ in prima ſimilis ſunt.*

If our Author had not explained himſelf in his Senſe, this would be quite unintelligible.

P. 92

P. 92. l. 19. *Verbum* URIO *curtat meditans.*

Mr. *Trotter* might have ſpared this Rule altogether, at leaſt it ought to have come under the Rule of his Derivatives, *p.* 89.

P. 93. l. 7. *Simul* erunt *protrahe & ere.*

Our Author might have ſpared this too, it being an idle Repetition, ſeeing the Quantity of ſuch Words, ending in *erunt* and *ere*, is comprehended under the general Rule, *E longum eſt creſcens.*

P. 94. l. 5. *Eſtque in his penultima genitivi crementum.*

One would conclude from this, that there were no Crement but in the Genitive ſingular. But what if the Noun ſhould want that Caſe? I don't think he will therefore ſay, it has no Crement in any oblique Caſe it may have, as in the Word *compede*, which has no other Caſe in the ſingular Number but the Ablative. Even Mr. *Ruddiman* has not expreſſed this ſo clearly as were to be wiſh'd in that Part of his Leſſer Grammar, but we may be aſſured it will be done in his Larger, ſo ſoon as it is publiſhed.

P. 97. l. 22. X *genitivum per* gis *faciens.*

Our Author, notwithſtanding his Humour of compendizing, yet, rather than follow *Deſpauter* or *Ruddiman*, has branched out one Rule into ſeven. This is another Inſtance of his affected Singularity. And yet he has neglected *abax*, *dropax*, *anthrax* and *ſtyrax*, alſo *Chœnix*, *Cilix* and *maſtix*, all which have their Crement ſhort.

P. 98. l. 2. Coxendix *contrahe*, natrix.

Contrahe is an unuſual Word in this Senſe; and the more faulty is he in uſing it, that his Verſe would have allowed him the common Word *corripe.*

P. 99. l. 15. *Et* mage *corripito.*

This is an idle Addition, *mage* being comprehended under the general Rule, unleſs he fancied *mage* an Adverb from *magnus*; which it is not, but from *magis*, which of old was an Adjective of the third, like *potis* and *pote*, as *Perizonius* ſhews.

P. 102. *l.* 17. Our Author has been in ſuch haſte here, that he

has forgot to give a Rule for the Quantity of OS in the End of a Word.

P. 103. l. 10. *Ars metrica, quæ aliter* verſificatio *dicitur.*

I think he ſhould have ſaid *verſificatoria.* But perhaps it is a typographical Error, as there are many of that kind in this Grammar beſides thoſe he has clapt to the Back of his Title-page.

P. 104. l. 6. *Tetraſyllabos hoſce pedes duos, nimi Proceleuſmat. & Choriamb. patris Deſpauterii vene rabundi manes, hîc quamquam gravatè attigimus; re liquos animus meminiſſe horret,* &c.

Mr. *Trotter* ſays, it is with ſome Reluctancy he has condeſcended to name *Proceleuſmaticus* and *Choriambus:* But I hope *Deſpauter*'s Name will preſerve him from Harm. Nay but he is affrighted at the very Mention or Remembrance (for *meminiſſe* implies both theſe) of the other tetraſyllable Feet. And if an old experienced Maſter is ſo terrified at ſuch Names, ſure his Scholars can't but go diſtracted. And if this is the Caſe, he certainly did well to abſtain from them, when likely to be attended with ſuch diſmal Conſequences. But perhaps this Fright is only in his own Imagination, and that not only Maſters, but Scholars alſo, may pronounce ſuch Words without catching any Harm: Otherwiſe he ſhould have cautioned his Scholars againſt reading *Cicero*, *Quintilian*, and other Authors who uſe *Dichoreus* and *Pæon*, and ſome ſuch Words. 'Tis true, our Author ſays, that all theſe are compound Feet, and may, like other Compounds, be reduced to their Simples. But does it hence follow, that the Uſe of all Compounds ſhould therefore be laid aſide, and a new Method of ſcanning Verſes introduced, utterly unknown both to the Ancients and Moderns? He had better have adviſed his Scholars not to meddle with Poeſy at all; and in that caſe he ought not to have given Rules about it, or treated of it in his Grammar. For, how uſeful ſoever it is for the right Pronunciation of *Latin*, yet, properly ſpeaking, it is no Part of Grammar, but rather conſtitutes an Art by itſelf. But if his Scholars will meddle with Poeſy to any purpoſe, then they muſt meet with many Words as conjuring and terrible as moſt of the Names of the compound Feet that here put him in ſuch a Fright; and that we need not go far to find them, he has given us himſelf ſome ſuch in the fa

ame Page, as *Triemimeris, penthemimeris, hepthemimeris,* &c. *Aca-alectticus, Catalecticus, Brachycatalecticus, Hypercatalecticus,* and ma-y more as formidable Words, in the following Pages.

P. 106. l. 2. *Synalæpha & Ecthlipſi parciſſimè u-endum, præcipuè ubi Eliſio aſperiùs ſonat.*

It is eaſy to give Rules, but not ſo eaſy to practice them; for here is none he has more tranſgreſſed than what he here gives, ma-y of his Verſes being, beſides their other Harſhneſs and Roughneſs, endred more ſo by the innumerable *Synalæpha's* and *Ecthlipſes* that un through them.

l. 9. *De Synæreſi & Diæreſi ſufficiant regulæ ſupe-iùs in Etymologia traditæ.*

If what he had ſaid there was ſufficient, why does he as fully in-ſt on them here, as if he had ſaid nothing at all of them before?

l. 26. *Eidem.*

I ſhall take this for another typographical Error, for *iidem*; or, it is not, then let him produce an Authority where *eidem* is con-acted.

P. 107. l. antepenult. Clara Deûm ſoboles.

This is another Error of the Preſs, or of the Author's Memory, r *cara.*

P. 109. l. 32. *Dactylus ante ſuum Spondæum eſt verſus Adonis.*

Our Author here uſes *Adonis* in the Genitive for *Adonidis,* but y what Authority he beſt knows himſelf.

P. 110. l. 19. *Verſus Aſclepiadæus conſtat Spondæo, Dactylo, Cæſurâ, & duobus Dactylis.*

Mr. *Trotter,* being in haſte, has omitted to tell, that this *Cæſura* uſt be a long Syllable always, and never ſhort. And the ſame ault he has fallen into with reſpect to the Pentameter.

P. 115. l. 19. *Epitritus ſecundus.*

I'm glad our Author has recovered himſelf here, after what he had ſaid above, and that he has the Courage to name one of theſe tetraſyllable Feet, as he does alſo mention *Ionicus à minore* in the following Paragraph.

Mr. *Trotter*, in this Page, that he might give a Specimen of his ſuperior Genius and Comprehenſion to moſt other Grammarians, and that he might ſhew, how the compound Feet, commonly uſed by others in ſcanning, may be reduced to their Simples, ſingles out the 12th Ode of *Horace*'s third Book for that purpoſe; and after he has told us of the uſual Diſpoſition of this Ode, which he by a grand Miſtake calls the *lectio vulgaris*, inſtead of *diſpoſitio* or *conſtitutio vulgaris*, for the Reading in moſt Copies is the ſame; after he has done this, I ſay, he delivers his Opinion in the following Words: *Quid autem ſi Pherecratio pentaſtropho conſtare hanc Odem dixerimus, Anapaſto in prima ſede locato, quod haud rarò facit Boethius, lectionemque* (*diſpoſitionem* he ſhould have ſaid) *in hunc modum ordinandam:*

Miſera-	*rum, eſt neque a-*	*mori*
Dare lu-	*dum, neque*	*dulci*
Mala vi-	*no lave-*	*re aut ex-*
-anima-	*ri metu-*	*entes*
Patruæ	*verbera*	*linguæ.*

Now, the famous Dr. *Bently* has, I'm perſuaded, ſettled this Matter to the Conviction of Mankind, and ſhewn, that this Ode, the only one of its Kind wrote by *Horace*, was compoſed in imitation of an Ode of *Alcæus* done in like Manner; and that it conſiſts often of thoſe Feet commonly called *Ionici à minore*, which are made up of two ſhort and two long Syllables. Dr. *Bently*'s Words are: *Quippe hæc ſimiliter decem pedibus Ionicis decurrit: inde rurſus initio capto, ſtadium idem metitur; & quatuor ejuſmodi decapodiis tota ſi mitur.* But becauſe this Verſe could not eaſily be contained in one Line, he diſpoſes it in the following Manner, by making the firſt two Lines to contain each four of theſe Feet, and the third two of them, thus:

Miſerarum eſt, nec amori dare ludum, neque dulci
Mala vino lavere; aut exanimari metuentis
Patruæ verbera linguæ.

And then he adds, *neque aliter ab Horatii manu profectum esse quovis pignore contenderim.*

If Mr. *Trotter* had read and considered what this great Man has said on the Disposition of this Ode, I don't think he would have troubled the World with that which is more unaccountable and foolish, than any or all the various Methods which learned Men have fallen into of distinguishing the Feet or Parts of this Ode. For, in the first Place, all Authors that have writ on the Art of Versification, not only the modern, but also the ancient, as *Hephæstion*, *Terentianus Maurus*, *Victorinus*, and others mentioned by *Bently*, constantly call this kind of Verse *Ionicum à minore*: And to what purpose should it have got this Name, if it is not to be measured by this Foot, from which it got this Denomination? Again, why does he call it *Pherecratian*, which is nothing else but the three last Feet of a common *Hexameter*, at least as it is used by *Horace*; and the *Anapæst* ought not regularly to come into it? 'Tis true indeed, as this Author says, that *Boethius* sometimes uses it: But that is but seldom, the *Spondee* being naturally its first Foot; whereas, according to Mr. *Trotter*'s Distribution, the *Anapæst* is constantly made use of in every Line. Further, why does he name it *Pentastrophon?* The Word *Strophe* always imports a Variety in the Measures in some one or more of the Verses of which it is composed. But here there is no Variety at all from the Beginning to the End, the whole twelve Verses making twenty *Pherecratians*, as he disposes them, without the least Variation in any Part of it. Besides, there is an ungrateful Intercision of a Word at the End of his Verse twice, *viz.* in *ex-animari*, and *Bel-lerophonte*, with which Dr. *Bently* is highly offended in the Distributions made of this Ode formerly by others. It is a Pity that Mr. *Trotter* has not pretended the Authority of an ancient Manuscript in some famous Library, to favour his Notion in this Affair, as one formerly did, at *Vienna*, which Dr. *Bently* informs us of, to justify his Management of this same Ode.

F I N I S.

A

DISSERTATION

Upon the Way of Teaching the

Latin Tongue:

WHEREIN

The Objections raiſed againſt Mr. *Ruddiman's*, and other ſuch like Grammars, for their being too full and particular, are anſwered and confuted;

And the vulgar Practice of Teaching *Latin* by a Grammar writ in the ſame Language, is juſtified and defended.

Together with

Some critical Remarks on the new Latin *Grammar compoſed by Mr.* John Clarke *Schoolmaſter at* Hull,

As alſo on the Uſe he would have to be made of his Literal Tranſlations.

EDINBURGH, Printed in the Year 1733.

A

DISSERTATION

Upon the Way of Teaching the

Latin Tongue:

WHEREIN

The Objections raised against Mr. *Ruddiman's*, and other such like Grammars, for their being too full and particular, are answered and confuted;

And the vulgar Practice of Teaching *Latin* by a Grammar writ in the same Language, is justified and defended.

Together with

Some critical Remarks on the new Latin Grammar composed by Mr. John Clarke *Schoolmaster at* Hull.

As also on the Use he would have to be made of his Literal Translations.

EDINBURGH: Printed in the Year 1723.

A DISSERTATION

Upon the Way of Teaching the *Latin Tongue*, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. IT is not a little ſurpriſing, that notwithſtanding the *Latin* Tongue has long ſince left off to be ſpoken by any one People in the World, and has thereby become in a great meaſure fixt and unalterable, as not being ſubject to thoſe Changes to which all Living Languages are naturally liable; yet, as if it were as fluctuating as theſe, there is no End of the manifold Syſtems of Grammar, and other Methods that are daily projected and ſet forth for the acquiring of it. Whether this proceeds from that Itch, which too many are affected with, of appearing in publick; or from this, that the ſeveral Authors do fondly imagine they have made new Diſcoveries in that Art, or have fallen upon a better and more expedite Way of teaching it (as they generally give out) than thoſe that went before them, I ſhall not determine. This much is certain, and has been a common Complaint for ſome Ages, that this unbounded Spirit of compiling new Grammars has proved very detrimental to Education, and been found by Experience to be attended with many bad Conſequences. I would not have this ſo underſtood, as if I ſuppoſed that this or any other liberal Art were brought to ſuch Perfection, that they were not capable of any farther Improvements. My Meaning only is, that Men ſhould curb their Inclinations this way, till ſuch time as they

were ſure they had made ſuch conſiderable Improvements, either in the Art itſelf, or in the Method of teaching it, that for the ſake thereof all other Grammars ought to be laid aſide. Had this Rule been duly obſerved, I am pretty confident that we ſhould not have been troubled with the far greater Part of thoſe innumerable Treatiſes, with which the World is peſter'd, upon that Subject. I ſhall not now take notice of the Faults of other Nations on this Head, my preſent Deſign being chiefly to obſerve the unaccountable Conduct ours has been guilty of in this Matter. It is now near two hundred Years ſince *Deſpauter*'s Grammar, as it had got an eſtabliſhed Reputation in moſt other Countries in *Europe*, was alſo introduced into ours: And it had perhaps been good for us, all things conſidered, that it had continued our *national Latin Grammar* to this Day. This I am almoſt ſure of, that in ſeveral Reſpects it is better than moſt of thoſe later Compoſures that have been contrived to juſtle it out of its Place. I would not willingly detract from any one's due Praiſe: But, to deal ingenuouſly in this Matter, it is obſervable, that moſt of the *Latin* Grammars writ by our Countrymen have very little new in them with reſpect to the Art itſelf; their Thoughts being chiefly taken up, either in compendizing and reforming (as they call it) *Deſpauter*'s Grammar, or inventing new Schemes of their own, and theſe as various and different from one another, as the Fancies and Opinions of the Heads that contrived them. What the Effects of this were, I have hinted before, namely, a perpetual Itch of Novelty in too many Maſters, and the great Confuſion and Diſorder conſequent upon it in the Schools.

§ 2. This growing Evil being obſerved and regreted by ſome judicious Teachers in this Country, Mr. *Thomas Ruddiman*, who had for ſome Time managed that Province himſelf, and given a good Specimen of his Abilities for undertaking ſuch a Work by the *Latin* Rudiments he had compoſed ſome Years before, was adviſed and encouraged by them to ſet about the writing of a new Grammar; hoping that if it was carried on with that Accuracy and Methodicalneſs that were requiſite, it would in ſome meaſure put a Stop to thoſe endleſs Plans and Projects that ſo much infeſted our Schools. Accordingly he applied himſelf to the Work; and having with great Labour and Diligence finiſhed it ſome Years ago, it was publiſhed and received with the general Satisfaction of the moſt learned and intelligent Judges in that Matter among us, and is now taught in the moſt conſiderable Schools of this Country.

§ 3. As to the Manner of executing his Deſign, *T. R.* took a Courſe very much differing from that uſed by moſt of thoſe that went before him: For, inſtead of framing endleſs Schemes and Methods, which was generally the Practice of his Predeceſſors, he

in the main contented himself with the old one used by *Despauter*, as being persuaded that it was in many Respects better than all or most of their new Contrivances. But that to which he chiefly applied his Care, was to correct the Errors and Mistakes into which *Despauter* or other modern Grammarians had fallen, and to conform the Art, as far as he was able, to the Use of the best and purest *Latin* Writers, which is the only Standard and Touchstone of Grammar. It was not to be expected, that any human Composure, far less his, should be free from all Faults and Blemishes; and no doubt several of these have escaped *T. R.*: But most People will own, that, notwithstanding these, his Performance is the most accurate and exact in its Kind of any hitherto extant. There are however on other accounts some Objections raised against it, the chief whereof are these two, *viz.*

1. *That its Rules are too numerous, and the Bulk of it thereby become too large for Boys to learn in the ordinary Time set apart for that purpose.*

2. *That it is composed in* Latin, *the very Language it is designed to teach; and which therefore cannot but render it extremely difficult to young ones, who are as yet supposed ignorant of that Language.*

§ 4. These Objections, it must be owned, do at first View seem very plausible, and to carry a considerable Weight in them for laying aside *T. R*'s Grammar: But I am hopeful to make it appear, that when the Matter is duly considered and examined, these things which are complained of as Faults in *T. R.*'s Performance, are so far from being so, that on the contrary they constitute a great Part of the Perfection and Usefulness of it. And it being my principal Design at present to render this evident to all unprejudiced Persons, I will be excused on that account to insist somewhat the more largely upon it.

****

SECT. I.

Objections raised against Mr. Ruddiman's, *and other such like Grammars, for their being too full and particular, answered and confuted.*

§ 1. AS to the *First* of these Objections, namely, *the great Bulk of his Grammar*, *T. R.* was aware of it from the very Beginning, and therefore did endeavour briefly to obviate it in the Prefaces to the First and Second Parts of his larger Work on that Subject. But because the short Hints there given may not seem satisfactory to every

Reader, and eſpecially becauſe Mr. *Trotter* Schoolmaſter of *Drumfries* is notwithſtanding ſo much diſpleaſed with the Length of T. R.'s Grammar, that he has therefore compoſed a new Compend of his own, it will be neceſſary to be more full and minute upon this Head.

And here our firſt Enquiry will be, what a *Latin* Grammar ought to contain. And the general Anſwer to this, I think, will be, That it ſhould comprehend in it ſuch a Syſtem of the Rules and Precepts of that Language, with an Exemplification of them, as is ſufficient for acquiring a competent Knowledge of it. This, I ſuppoſe, all are agreed in: But then the next Queſtion is, What, or how many of theſe Rules are ſufficient; whether a larger or a fewer Number? or, in other Words, Whether a Compend of its principal and chief Rules will do the Buſineſs, or if it be fit and proper to take in alſo thoſe other Rules, which, though not ſo eſſential as the former, are yet common and ordinary Laws, according to which the beſt Authors of the Language uſed to ſpeak, when Occaſion required it? This is that grand Queſtion, which has for ſome Ages variouſly exerciſed the Minds of the Teachers of that Language, and ſeems to be as far removed from a ſettled Iſſue and Determination as ever.

§ 2. The beſt Way, one would think, to come to ſome Clearneſs in this Point, is, to conſider the Nature of that Language, and the great Difference there is betwixt it and all the modern Languages now in uſe, not only in *Europe*, but I may ſay in the whole World. That the *Latin* Tongue is not only very copious, with reſpect to the Number of its Words, but hath alſo a vaſt Variety in it with reſpect to the Inflexion and Diſpoſition of them, beyond moſt other Languages, is what no one tolerably acquainted with it can doubt of. Again, it muſt with the ſame Certainty be owned, that the more copious any Language is, and the greater Variety there is in the Arangement and Structure of its Parts, the greater Number of Rules will be neceſſary for the right acquiring of it. This being the Caſe with the *Latin* Tongue, which it is not in our power in the leaſt to alter, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that a Grammar deſigned to teach it, muſt bear a due Proportion to this great Copiouſneſs and Variety that is to be found in it; and ſo far as ſuch a Grammar falls under that Proportion, it is ſo far defective and imperfect, and thereby comes ſhort of the End propoſed by it. And this, with all Deference to the Authors of them on other accounts, I cannot help thinking to be the general Fault of moſt of the Grammars of that Language that have of late Years been publiſhed in this and our neighbour Nation; and which, as I ſhall ſhew afterwards, holds manifeſtly true with reſpect to Mr. *Trotter*'s Performance.

§ 3. I know 'tis commonly alledged in juſtification of ſuch Compends, That the Omiſſions or Defects in them are of Things not ve-

y material, and which may be easily learned by Observation and Practice.

I. As to the First of these Pleas: Though it is very true, that here are some Things in Grammar more necessary and useful than others; yet I wish these Compend-Writers had given us some general Criterion, by which they might be distinguished from one another. One thing I am sure of, that there are not any two of them who are agreed in that Point; and there are none of them almost, wherein you shall not find some things less material set down, and others more material omitted. Of this I shall give a few Instances, of many, from the two latest Grammars of that kind I have seen, *viz.* Mr. *Trotter*'s and Mr. *Clarke*'s, and the rather because this last sets up for a great Master and Dictator in that Art.

§ 4. To begin with Mr. *Trotter*: He, in his 1st Rule, takes in the proper Name of a *Horse*, and omits proper Names of *People*, as *Persa, Tros, Macedo*, which by his Grammar no Man can determine the Gender of. Rules 4 & 7. are so generally express'd, that it is not easy to tell what is comprehended under them, and what not. Rule 10. he omits to take notice that *margo* is sometimes feminine, and yet Rule 21. he makes *colus* indifferently masc. or fem. whereas there is only one Instance of its being masc. *viz.* in *Catullus*, and that not absolutely certain neither. Rule 18. he hath omitted *ales* of the dubious Gender, it being often found in both grammatical Genders, without Respect to its Sex; and yet he hath noticed *tradux* and *grex* sometimes feminine, of which the Examples are very rare. Rule 26. among Words that want the sing. Number, he mentions *exuviæ, offuciæ, parietinæ, affaniæ*, and some others that very rarely occur; and yet hath omitted *fasces, decimæ, tenebræ, mœnia* and *brevia*, which are vastly more frequent. Rule 50. he mentions *mutuil, compos, impos*, as having *um* not *ium* in their Genitive plural, though these Genitives are scarce ever to be met with; and yet omits *lynx, gryps*, and some such like Words, that are more frequent, and have their Genitives plural in *um*, contrary to his Rule 52. Page 38. R. 5. he makes the Compounds of *sorbeo* have indifferently *sorbui* and *sorpsi*, though there is only one Instance of *sorpsi* in *absorpsi* in *Lucan*, and that probably from *absorbo* of the third Conjugation: But he omits to tell us, that *arceo* wants the Supine, which its Compounds have; and that *taceo* and *lateo* have the Supine, which their Compounds want. Page 39. R. 12. he tells us, (and that without Ground too) that *abstineo* wants the Supine; and yet in R. 7. *p.* 38. he tells us nothing of the Conjugation of *tondeo*, which therefore, according to his general Rule, ought to have *tondui, tonditum*. Page 47. R. 42. he notices *glocio, dementio* and *fecio*, though Verbs very unfrequent, as wanting the Supine; and

yet

yet leaves out *proſilio*, a Verb more common, which alſo wants i
Page 57. he is very liberal in his Rules concerning the Relative, wh
there was little or no Need for it: But he is very ſparing in thin
more material; for we have no Rule about the Conſtruction of
which moſt even of the ſhort Compends take notice of. In like ma
ner he is pretty minute concerning *verbal Adjectives* governing t
Genitive Rule 22. and yet very general about *Partitives* Rule
when he ought to have done the quite contrary. So, R. 30. he ta
in *par* and *fidus*, of which there are very few Inſtances with the G
nitive; and left out *æqualis*, of which there are very many. Th
(to add no more) Rule 46. he hath quite omitted *communico*, *
gnor*, *fido*, *muto*, *ſto*, and ſome other Verbs which are conſtruct
with the Ablative, and whereof Examples are very frequent; thou
he hath in many Places mentioned things of far leſs Importance, ſu
as the Conſtruction of *pertæſus*, *exoſus* and *peroſus*, R. 53.

§ 5. Thus much for a Sample of Mr. *Trotter*'s Diſagreements wi
himſelf in this Particular: I proceed to give the like Specimen in M
Clarke. Page 6. he takes notice of *pandecta*'s being maſculine, (whi
by the by is more probably feminine,) and takes no notice of *ta*
and *dama* ſometimes maſc. and *paſcha* always neuter. P. 7. he me
tions *abyſſus*, *cryſtallus* and *dialectus*, among the Feminines in
and omits *eremus*, *antidotus*, *pharus*, which are alſo feminine,
as frequently uſed as ſome of thoſe. 'Tis true, he concludes
Rule with an *&c.* but what that may contain, few Men, I'm ſure
Boy, can tell. *Ibid.* he mentions *camelus* and *colus* among the dou
ful, though the former is very rarely feminine, and the other ſca
ever maſculine, as I hinted above; and yet he omits to take notice
vulgus maſc. or neut. and *virus* and *pelagus* only neuter. In the ſa
Rule he reckons *pampinus* among the Doubtfuls, whereas it is no wh
uſed in the feminine, but in theſe antique Authors, who gave t
ſame Gender to *limus*, *lembus*, *lepus*, *agnus*, and ſeveral others, wh
the Cuſtom of the beſt Writers afterwards fixed in the maſculine,
Priſcian informs us, *p.* 658. Page 8. he idly tells us, that *cuſtos*
bos are common, ſince they are contained and mentioned as ſuch
his 9th Rule *p.* 12. In the ſame Page 8. we have a remarkable
ſtance of our Author's ſupine Thoughtleſneſs: For having told t
Learner, in his general Rule, *n.* 6. that Nouns in O are feminine,
mong his Exceptions he reckons up ſome Words that might have be
ſpared, as *optio*, *pumilio*, *puſio*, which belong to his firſt gene
Rule; to which alſo ought to be referred a very uncommon No
mentioned there, *burdo*, a Mule, ingendred in a Horſe and
She-Aſs. He might alſo have omitted (had not perhaps his Rhi
made it neceſſary) *duernio*, there being no ſuch Word in any go
Author. But this is not the worſt; for the Nouns he hath omi

e more numerous, and moſt of them more frequent, than theſe hath ſet down, as the following Liſt will ſhew: *Arrhabo, carbo, to, mucro, muto, myoparo, pepo, pero, petaſo, [illegible], pulmo, ſa- ſipho, ſtolo, temo, tendo, tolleno, turbo, umbo,* not to mention eſe uncommon Words, *apexabo, catampo, melopepo, paro, ponto, eno,* which according to his Grammar ought all to be feminine, ntrary to the Uſe of the beſt Authors. Page 9. he mentions *ter- es, ames, trudes* and *tudes*, and omits *cacoëthes, hippomanes, nepen- s* and *penaces*, neuter, which are equally common: And here al- he without Neceſſity brings in *Aries*, which is maſc. by his firſt neral Rule, and *præs*, which is common by the 9th. *Ibid.* though his Exceptions of Nouns in *IS* that are maſculine, he hath men- ned ſome not very common, yet he hath omitted *crinis, ignis* and *nis*, than which there are not any in the *Latin* Tongue more u- al. Page 10. he places *retis* among the doubtful, though the Word elf has been long ſince diſuſed by all good Authors, *rete* being put its Place. *Ibid.* he omits to mention *ſerpens* as common, though that Rule he names ſeveral Words, as *ſeps, merops, urpix, &c.* no- ing ſo uſual. *Ibid.* he likewiſe omits *fornax, ſmilax, carex, pa- x* and *forfex*, feminine; which therefore he ſhould have except- from Diſſyllables in *AX* and *EX* that are maſc. *Ibid.* Among e Doubtfuls in *X*, he omits *hiſtrix, ſardonix, rumex, ſilex, cortex, ex, pumex* and *limax*, though thoſe he hath mentioned are not ore uſual: Not to ſpeak of *varix*, which is as doubtful as any of em, though he has made it maſculine; as on the contrary, in his xt Rule, he makes *grus* only fem. though *Horace* uſes it maſc. *I- d.* & *p.* 11. he makes all Nouns in *N* neuter, and quite overlooks *an, attagen, lichen, lien, ren, ſplen, delphin, canon, dolon, gnomon, rizon, ſiphon*, all maſc. and *aëdon, icon, alcyon, ſindon*, fem. tho' e has there Nouns of as unfrequent Uſe as moſt of them. Page 11. s 8th Rule is very general indeed, and ſo much ſo, that it is al- oſt good for nothing: For, not to mention others, how ſhall one ow what Gender *Styx, Lethe, Argos, Londinum, Zeugma, Reate, raneſte, Tibur, Hiſpal, Illiturgi, Pariſii, Saſon, Pontus, Canopus, unes, Anxur*, and many others, are of, by this Rule? One would ink that ſome of theſe at leaſt were as well worth noticing as Names Trees in *STER*; which is only true of *oleaſter*, for *pinaſter* is vice fem. in *Pliny*, and never maſc. in any Author now extant. age 12. he gives a no leſs confuſed, than compendious Account of teroclite or irregular Nouns. For 1*ſt*, He confounds his *Aptotes*, or oſe that have all or moſt of their Caſes, but are invariable in them, *ſinapi, gelu, ſemis, nequam, tot, quot, &c.* with thoſe that have me few Caſes, but being generally of the neuter Gender, have theſe aſes invariable by the common Laws of Declenſion, as *cacoëthes,*

epos,

epos, *melos*, *fas*, *nefas*, *prolubium*, which have only the Nominati and Accuſative, (for we muſt not now ſpeak of their having the Voc tive, he having baniſhed that Caſe out of the *Latin* Tongue) and ther fore theſe laſt ought rather to have been ranked among his *Diptotes* as *glos*, which he reckons among the *Aptotes*, ought to be placed a mong the *Monoptotes*, (though *Priſcian* declines it *gloris*, *glori*, &c. for there is no Reaſon why *dicis*, which has only the Genitive, *in tas* only the Accuſative, *injuſſu* only the Ablative, ſhould be accoun ed *Monoptotes* (as he does) more than *glos*, which according to hi has only the Nominative; unleſs he will ſay that it has all its Caſe but is indeclinable, like *genu*. 2*dly*, There is the ſame Objection a gainſt his *Diptotes* and *Triptotes*: For if he will allow Nouns to ha no more Caſes than they have different Terminations; then *æra*, *ma ria*, *ora* and *ſoles*, which he makes *Diptotes*, muſt want the Accuſa tive and Ablative; and *plus*, which he makes a *Triptote*, muſt wa the Accuſative: Nay, according to his Rules, all regular Nouns *UM*, *E* and *AR* neuter, muſt be *Triptotes*, as having only three V riations in their ſingular, and conſequently, according to him, thr Caſes. 3*dly*, and which I chiefly take notice of here, is, his brin ing in Words, either not at all, or very rarely uſed, and omitting thers that are pretty common. Of the firſt Sort are *Averni*, *ſupe ſtilia*, *cœla*, *fili* and *capiſtri*, in the Nominative plural, for which am poſitive he has no good Authority. *Deſpauter* indeed brings an E ample of *Averni* plural from *Claudian*, *de rapt. Proſerp. lib.* 1. ℣. 2 *Dii*, *quibus in numerum vaſti famulantur Averni*. But had he co ſidered the two Words following, *Vulgus iners*, he might eaſily ha perceived, that *Averni* there is the Genitive ſing. and not the N minative plur. He cites alſo, for *fili* plur. that of *Lucan*, vi. 46 *Traxerunt torti magicâ vertigine fili*: But it ſeems more probab from the Context, that it is there the Genitive ſing. *Theſſalides neſicæ*, of whom he is there ſpeaking, being underſtood. But f the other three, neither he, nor any other that I know, bring a direct Voucher: For though *Cicero* ſays, *Epiſt. fam.* ix. *ult. Ille h ro putabat te quæſiturum, unum cœlum eſſet, an innumerabilia*; y we are not ſure that he would have ſaid *cœla*. See *Sanctii Miner* iv. 2. Of the ſame kind is *ducentum*; which is a Word I am n acquainted with, and is the leſs neceſſary, when we have of t ſame Signification *bis centum* and *ducenti*. Again, he has *glos*, *a gu*, *pecu*, *nauco*, which are rarely to be met with; and omits *mo*, *aër*; *argilla*, *tabes*; *pus*, *veternum*, *fœnum*, *ſabulum*, *ſeni lutum*, *ver*, *ebur*, *nectar*, *tabum*, *pelagus*, *cœnum*, as wanting t plural: And *faſces*, *pugillares*, *majores*, *minores*, *poſteri*, *ſuperi*, *feri*; *quiſquilia*, *therma*, *ſcopæ*, *reliquiæ*, *gerræ*, *vindiciæ*; *tranſ parapherna*, *teſqua*, *crepundia*, *præcordia*, *comitia*, *roſtra*, *ilia*, *b*

via, *magalia*, as wanting the ſingular; though as common as moſt of the Words he mentions of thoſe kinds. It is true he adds an *&c.* to them; but what it may contain in the Belly of it, no Boy can ſo much as conjecture. Page 28. in his *Paradigmata* of the Verbs, he brings into the Imperative *amet*, *amemus* and *ament*, *&c.* which are Parts of the Subjunctive, and not the Imperative, no more than *amnes* and *ametis*. He is guilty of the ſame Fault in the paſſive Imperative; and, as if that had not been enough, he adds the Termination *minor*; *amaminor*, *doceminor*, *legiminor*, *audiminor*: Which is the more unaccountable in him, that there is ſo far from being ſuch Words in the World, that there are only two Inſtances of that Termination, *arbitraminor* and *progrediminor*, in *Plautus*, a very ancient Author, ſince whoſe Time, which was near two thouſand Years ago, it has quite been laid aſide; and yet he is ſo nice, that of all the four Conjugations he drops the Supine, except the laſt, *auditum*, *auditu*, (ſee *p.* 31.) though in the Infinitive of the paſſive Voice he thinks fit to take them in, *amatum iri*, *doctum iri*, *&c.* I might ſhew the like Diſconformity in his *Syntax*: But, as I will have occaſion to ſpeak of it afterwards on another account, and as the Specimen I have already given is more than ſufficient to ſhew how natural it is for theſe Compend-Writers to be inconſiſtent with themſelves as to what is more or leſs material in Grammar, I therefore proceed to,

§ 6. II. The Second Pretext made uſe of by theſe Epitomizers, namely, That the Things omitted by them are ſuch, as it is better to leave them to the Scholar's Obſervation from the Authors he reads, than to burden his Memory by ſetting them down in a Grammar. This Pretence may at firſt ſeem ſomewhat taking with thoſe that have not duly conſidered it; but, when carefully examined into, will be found at the bottom a mere Deluſion. I need not here tell, how little is to be expected from the Obſervation of heedleſs Boys, who can hardly be brought to notice, as they ought, the moſt common Rules, though frequently inculcated upon them. But, put the Caſe they ſhould be capable of making theſe Obſervations, I would fain aſk, which of the two is the eaſieſt Task, to mandate a Rule formed from the Obſervation of others, or to make that Obſervation myſelf. The one is performed without much Trouble, and is the Work of mere Memory only; the other is the Reſult of much Reading, Attention and Judgment: Or, in other Words, The one is (to ſpeak with the Logicians) the inferring a Concluſion from an Induction of a great Number of Examples, gathered and compared with much Labour and Application; the other is taking up with the Concluſion immediately, being pretty ſecure not to err, becauſe it is made by better Heads than my own, who have been at that Pains and Drudgery for me. After all, what is this or that Obſervation,

when made, but fixing in my Mind, or, if you will, ſetting down in Writing a Rule I have gathered in my Reading, to be hereafter obſerved or followed by me, as I ſhall have Uſe for it? In this, as well as the former Caſe, the Thing is to be equally remembred and kept in my Mind, otherwiſe it can be of no Service to me: With this conſiderable Difference, that the one is much more eaſily obtained, and is more ſure to truſt to in all Reſpects than the other. But ſince, as I ſaid, moſt Boys, and even ſome Maſters, are not ſo much as capable of making ſuch Obſervations to any tolerable Extent or Advantage, we may leave it to the World to judge, what Proficiency ſuch either Scholars or Maſters are like to make, if left to themſelves in theſe Matters. Is it not then vaſtly better to have ſuch Rules or Obſervations (call them as you will, the Thing is the ſame) always ready in Writing for their Direction, than to ſet them out to ſhift for themſelves among the whole Train of Claſſicks, where through want of Skill or Application, they are never likely to find them?

§ 7. But then it will be ſaid, That theſe Rules at this rate are rendred ſo numerous, that it is a great Burden to remember them. Grant it to be ſo; who can help it? That Fault, if it is one, is not the Fault of the Grammar, but of the Language itſelf. The *Latin* Tongue, as I ſaid before, has a great Variety in it; and, if it is worth the learning, that Variety muſt be carefully ſtudied and obſerved. Let our Grammars or Methods of acquiring it be long or ſhort, it continues always the ſame, and will not in the leaſt alter by our various Schemes and Models of teaching it, be what they will. Only this much is probable, that the more general and compendious our Schemes are, we ſhall take in the leſs of that great but beautiful Variety that is in that Language: Which indeed, after all our Arts or Contrivances, will coſt no ſmall Pains to come at; but at laſt, when in a competent Meaſure obtained, fully compenſates all that Pains by the Pleaſure and Satisfaction which is to be had in the Purchaſe.

§ 8. Well, but muſt all things that can be gathered by Obſervation from the *Latin* Authors be put into a *Latin* Grammar? No truly. There are innumerable Things to be obſerved in theſe Authors, with which Grammar is in nowiſe concerned; and theſe, ſure cannot be pertinently brought into it. There are likewiſe a great many other things, which indeed have a remote Relation to Grammar, ſuch as that infinite Variety in the Phraſeology, and changing the ſame Sentences a great many different Ways, the Senſe ſtill continuing the ſame: But as theſe do not directly and immediately affect the Grammatical Part of the Language, but rather are comprehended under the Rules of Oratory or Poetry, they ought very ſparingly to be taken notice of in Grammar. The Obſervations therefore which are proper to be made Rules of Grammar, are ſuch as con-

ute the right and true Ways of ſpeaking in that Language, without due Knowledge whereof no Man can be ſaid to underſtand the Language to purpoſe, or know how to make a right Uſe of it either n ſpeaking or writing. To be a little more particular: The Parts f this, as well as of all other Grammars, are generally reckoned our; *Orthography*, *Proſody*, *Etymology* and *Syntax*. Now, in each f theſe there is a Gradation, and a Subſerviency of that which goes efore to that which follows after. Thus, the firſt teaches what re-ates to the Names, Powers or Sounds of Letters, and their due U-ion together to make up Syllables. The ſecond teaches the true Ac-ent and Quantity of theſe Syllables, in order to the right Pronun-iation of them when put together in Words. The third teaches he ſeveral Claſſes of Words, their diſtinguiſhing Characters, Pro-erties and Accidents, and the various Changes to which they are ereby ſubject, that according to theſe they may be duly ordered in entences. And the laſt Part lays down the ſeveral Rules and Dire-ions by which the right ordering of Words in Sentences is to be erformed. From this ſhort Account of the Matter, it is clearly evi-ent, that there is an inſeparable Connexion of all theſe Parts with ne another; and that the laſt, which is the principal End of all, annot be executed without the Knowledge of the three preceeding; theſe three alſo are ſucceſſively the Foundation and Ground work f that, and one of another. Whence it neceſſarily follows, that ſo r as the Learner is ignorant or deficient in any of the three firſt, pecially the Etymological Part, he is ſo far ignorant or deficient in e laſt Part: And again, without underſtanding in ſome good Mea-re the laſt Part, he muſt ſo far come ſhort in the Uſe that is to be ade of the former. For how can he diſpoſe Words aright in a ntence, that knows not the reſpective Natures of theſe Words, d the various Changes they are capable of in it, according to their rious Inflexions, Genders, Caſes, Numbers, Moods, Tenſes, *&c.* ith the Irregularities that are in many of them? And again, if knows not the Rules of Conſtruction, according to which they e to be modelled in a Sentence, how can he rightly apply them to s Purpoſe in Speech? To make this plainer, if poſſible, by a few xamples: Let it be ſuppoſed that a Boy has ſuch Sentences as theſe turn into *Latin*; He cut down a ſturdy Oak; Lacedemon as not ſurrounded with Walls. As he has no Rule in Mr. *Trot-r*'s Grammar, as to the Gender of theſe two Nouns, *robur* and *La-dæmon*, but a very general one, telling him that Names of *Trees* d *Towns* are commonly feminine, but ſome of them follow the ender of their Termination, he will be at a loſs what Gender to ve them. For if he follows the Rule of Signification, and ſays, *cidit validam roborem, Lacedæmon non erat mœnibus circundata,*

he will be wrong in the former, though right in the latter: But if he follows the Rule of Termination, and ſays, *Succidit validum robur, Lacedæmon non erat mœnibus circundatus*, he will be wrong in the latter, though right in the former. Thus, if he is to render into *Latin*, Joſeph ſhaved himſelf: As Mr. *Trotter* has no Rule for the Preterite of that Verb *tondeo*, but a general one, That Verbs of that Conjugation have *ui*; as he is not obliged to be wiſer than his Grammar does make him, he will very readily ſay, *Joſephus ſe* [*vel comam*] *tonduit*; which yet is wrong, and contrary to the Rules of the Language. But had his Grammar taught him, as it ought, that *robur* was of the neuter Gender, *Lacedæmon* of the feminine, and that *tondeo* had *totondi* for its Preterite, he might with Aſſurance ſay, *Succidit validum robur, Lacedæmon mœnibus non erat circundata*, and, *Joſephus ſe totondit*. In like manner, were he to make *Latin* of theſe Sentences, The Safety of the People leans or depends on the Safety of the Prince, The Athenians did not ſtand to the Covenant they had made: As the Scholar has no particular Rules in Mr. *Trotter*'s Grammar concerning the Conſtruction of the Verbs *nitor* and *ſto*, which are fit to be made uſe of in theſe Sentences, 'tis more than probable, that if he has been taught that Grammar, he will render the firſt, *Salus populi in ſalute* [or *ſalutem*] *Principis nititur*, and the ſecond, *Athenienſes fœderi quod pepigerant non ſteterunt*; both which I doubt very much to be *Latin*. But had his Grammar informed him, as it ought, that both theſe Verbs are joined with the Ablative without any Prepoſition, he would ſoon diſcover that he ſhould ſay, *Salus populi ſalute Principis nititur*, and, *Athenienſes fœdere quod pepigerant non ſteterunt*. I might bring innumerable Inſtances of the like kind from theſe compendious Grammars, particularly from Mr. *Clarke*'s, which is yet more obnoxious that way than Mr. *Trotter*'s: but that, from what I have already ſaid, it is ſufficiently evident, that the leſs of that great Variety which is really and unalterably in the *Latin* Tongue, is ſet down in the Grammars that are deſigned to teach it; ſo much the more imperfect and defective will the Learner's Knowledge of it be, and he of conſequence be the more incapable of underſtanding a Book written in that Language, and yet more ſo of ſpeaking or writing it himſelf.

§ 8. It is indeed beyond all queſtion, that in this, as in all other Arts, there are ſome things of more, and ſome of leſs Moment; and that the former ought therefore to have the Preference of, and be more ſtrongly and frequently inculcated than the latter: But it does by no means follow, that the latter ſhould for that Reaſon be quite neglected or laid aſide. Let each have their Place according to their due Eſtimate, and ſo as the one does not deſtroy or juſtle out the other. It is in Grammar, eſpecially in *Conſtruction* the chief Part of

as in *Building*, to which it bears a near Resemblance; where, ough the greatest and more essential Parts are principally to be at- nded to, yet the lesser are not to be quite overlook'd and neglect- d: Otherwise that Symmetry and Proportion that ought to appear the whole, will be very much lessen'd, if not altogether destroy- d. Thus *T. R.* though he has always made a Distinction between e more and the less material Rules of his Grammar, and has, so r as he conveniently could, for that Reason, put the one in bigger, nd the other in smaller Characters; yet it was never his Intention at the latter should stand there as useless, but on the contrary, hat they also should some time or other be read, and that with some ccuracy too, though not with so great Application and Care as the rmer.

§ 9. There is one Advantage to be reap'd from this Method, that not to be met with in your small Compends, where those things f less Moment are quite left out; and that is, that though those smal- r Things should be little heeded at first by the Learner, yet, if he a Boy of tolerable Smartness, and knows the general Method in hich his Grammar is digested, he can, as his Occasions shall re- uire it, have Recourse to his Grammar as it were to a Dictionary, nd there meet with such Things as he wants to be informed of. hus, for Instance, suppose that he wants to know, when he ought o say *amor tuus*, and when *amor tui*; when *sui* and *suus* are to be u- d, and when *is, ejus, &c.*; whether he should say *memor vestri*, or *ve- strûm*, and *optimus nostri*, or *nostrûm*, and the like, (concerning which here is nothing to be found either in Mr. *Trotter* or Mr. *Clarke*'s rammars:) If he does but in the general remember, that in such a art of *T. R.*'s Grammar there are two *Appendices* concerning these ronouns, by turning to the Place he will find the Directions he ants concerning them. In like manner, if he is uncertain, whe- er he may not say, *Assuescere re aliquâ*, as well as *rei alicui*; *In- iti hastæ*, or *in hastam*, or *hastâ*; *Res latet mihi*, or *me, &c.*: If e has but slightly glanced over his Grammar, he may remember, hat in a certain Place there is a long alphabetical List of the Con- truction of such kind of Verbs. But if he has been taught the above amed Compends, he can expect to meet with no such Assistance; nd therefore must be left in the dark about these and the like, till ch time as he shall by his own Industry and Reading discover them Authors: And when that shall happen, by what is said above we ay easily conjecture.

§ 10. But it will be replied to all this, That if such minute and rticular Observations as these shall be brought into Grammar, it ill swell to a *portentosa longitudo*, as Mr. *Trotter* expresses it, and ove such a Burden as neither Scholar or Master can well bear.

But

But to this it may be anſwered in the 1*ſt* Place, That this Bulk, ſ
much complain'd of by Mr. *Trotter* and others, if it is a Fault, a
was before obſerved, it is the Fault of the Language itſelf, whoſ
Variety is ſo great, that its Grammar cannot well be comprehende
in fewer Rules, without being thereby ſo far lame and imperfect.
But 2*dly*, This Bulk is not ſo great as is pretended; nor is there ſuch
Difficulty either in teaching or learning what is contained therein, a
theſe Men give out. The Size of it is ſuch as makes it portable e
nough, it ſcarce being ſo big as a *New Teſtament*; and, if rightly
managed by a judicious Maſter, any Scholar of a tolerable Capacity
may be taught all that is contained in it in the Time uſually allowe
at Schools for that purpoſe. In this ſtill it is to be underſtood, tha
a Diſtinction is to be made betwixt what is of more or leſs Impor-
tance; and that the Diligence applied to each do bear a ſuitable Pro-
portion to their reſpective more or leſs Uſefulneſs and Value. Nay
3*dly*, I yet further maintain, that the great Length of *T. R.*'s Gram-
mar, ſo much quarrelled by theſe Men, is one chief Means of ren-
dring it more eaſy. For, the Author having it chiefly in his View
to make his Rules as clear and perſpicuous as poſſible, and of conſe-
quence the more eaſy to be acquir'd and retain'd, put himſelf into
no Pain as to the large or narrow Bounds within which they ſhould
be circumſcribed: Whereas theſe Authors that value themſelves on
the Fewneſs of their Rules, and the Conciſeneſs in which they are
expreſs'd, do commonly fall into two Faults, *Defectiveneſs* and Ob-
ſcurity, not to mention the want of *Method* and *Order*, with which
alſo they are for the moſt part attended. I have already given my
Thoughts of their Defectiveneſs, and ſhewed that they, by their be-
ing few and very general, can hardly miſs to fall ſhort of the Pro-
portion that ought to be between them and the Language. And it
is commonly obſerved as a Thing almoſt unavoidable, that Brevity
is accompanied with Obſcurity: And this Obſcurity, as it is perhaps
the greateſt Fault of all others, either in Speaking or Writing; ſo it
is in a ſignal manner yet worſe in Teaching, where the Learner be-
ing ſuppoſed not only ignorant of what is taught, but alſo (by rea-
ſon of his Age) of a weak Capacity, ſhould have every thing made
as plain to him as poſſible.

§ 11. *T. R.* therefore, intending to keep free of this Fault, and
to adapt his Inſtructions to the Capacities of young ones as far as
he was able, thought himſelf obliged above all things to digeſt them
in the moſt eaſy and natural Method, and to expreſs them in the
cleareſt and moſt intelligible Terms he could think of. For this End
that he might at once both direct the Judgment and aſſiſt the Me-
mory, he hath, in the 1*ſt* Place, divided the whole into its ſeveral
Parts, Books, Chapters, Sections and Paragraphs, with proper Titles
a

rd Numbers all along adjected to each of them: The want of which moſt of our Compend-Writers, and particularly in Mr. *Trotter*, nders their Performances very confus'd and irregular. *2dly*, In very Book and Chapter are firſt ſet down the Definitions and Divi-ons of the Things there treated of: Which is alſo in a great mea-re wanting in Mr. *Trotter*. *3dly*, The chief Rules are every where rſt delivered in Verſe, for the ſake of the Memory: But becauſe eſe Verſe Rules are neceſſarily attended with ſome Obſcurity to eginners, therefore they are reſum'd and again more fully ex-ain'd in Proſe; and, which is the Life of Inſtruction, always il-ſtrated with a competent Number of Examples, with the proper *ngliſh* through the whole firſt Part (where it ſeem'd moſt neceſſa-) immediately ſubjoin'd to them.

§ 12. As to the *Verſe-Rules*, the Compoſer's Genius being migh-y cramped with a great Number of looſe independent Words, it is ot to be expected, that they will always run with that Smoothneſs d Fluency that is to be found in other Compoſures, where the Au-or's Muſe is not ſo fetter'd and reſtrain'd: Inſomuch that it holds re as much as any where true, what *Manilius* ſays of his *Aſtronomy*,

Ornari res ipſa negat, contenta doceri.

et ſtill, notwithſtanding this Diſadvantage, Endeavours ought to uſed to make the Verſes as harmonious as poſſible; to avoid that uggedneſs and Harſhneſs, that great Number of *Ecthlipſes* and *Sy-lepha* that render them both grating to the Ear, and difficult to e Memory. This *T. R.* hath all along ſtudied to ſhun; and upon e main, I believe, it will be found, that of all the Grammar-Rules mpoſed in Verſe, there are few or none extant, wherein the Poe-al Diction, Numbers and Eaſineſs have been better kept up than his. 'Tis true, all theſe Verſes are not of *T. R.*'s own compoſing: he, I ſuppoſe, had no Thought of purchaſing Fame to himſelf om ſuch a barren Field of Poetry, ſo he made no ſcruple to bor-w from others, as *Deſpauter*, *Alvarus*, *&c.* where he found them reeably done to his hand: Whereas Mr. *Trotter*, who was reſol-d to have the whole Glory of his Performance to himſelf, and oſe rather to have almoſt every thing in Verſe of his own com-oſing, than to be beholden to another for it, though much better ne, has thereby given us for the moſt part ſuch wretched Stuff, at it is a Pain to the Voice to repeat, or the Ear to hear ſuch Po-ry. He has indeed compriſed his Rules in leſs Bounds than *T. R.* d moſt others that went before him: But, for all that, he has not ereby abridged the Labour of the Scholar. For I do maintain, d am almoſt content to put the Iſſue of the whole Cauſe upon it,

that

that though the Verſe-lines of *T. R.*'s Grammar are much more numerous than his, yet laying aſide the irregular Nouns, for which Mr. *Trotter* has no Verſe-Rules, though the metrical Part of *R.*'s Grammar is much larger than his, yet a Boy ſhall commit to Memory ſooner, and retain better the one than the other. For my own part, to give an Inſtance or two out of many, I could ſooner and with leſs Difficulty fix in my Mind twenty Lines of a good Verſe Author, than theſe three of Mr. *Trotter*'s, *p.* 27.

IM *vel* IN, *aut dat* IDEM, *mas* IS, *ſed vix* IDA *quarto*:
Vix IS, IN, IM; YS, YN, YM, *muliebre*; DA DEM*ve ſed* etc.
At purè creſcens IS, IN IM*ve*; YS, YN, YM *modò poſcit.*

And a dozen perhaps of the former, ſooner than that one of Mr. *Trotter*'s, *p.* 30.

Glis, faux, nix, nox, cor, lis, cos*que*, cohors*que*, Quiris, mus.

§ 13. There is, beſides this Conciſeneſs of his Rules, another thing that Mr. *Trotter*, as he tells us in his Preface, highly values himſelf upon, which I on the other hand take to be one of the greateſt Deformities in his Performance, *viz.* That in his Rules the Maſter is not obliged, as in other Grammars, to order the Scholar *tangere partem regulæ*, as the Phraſe is; but that every Part is a full and complete Senſe of itſelf, independently of what went before. This, I ſay, hath theſe Blemiſhes and Defects in it: 1*ſt*, That it ever and anon breaks that Connexion that ought to be of Sentences or Clauſes one with another, which is a chief Beauty in Speech, whether Verſe or Proſe, eſpecially the former. 2*dly*, It creates a nauſeous Repetition of the ſame Words, than which nothing can be more contrary to that harmonious Variety that ought to be in Poetry. But 3*dly*, and which is worſt of all, It renders what is ſaid ambiguous and uncertain: For there is nothing more apt to miſlead the Learner, than when Words, either the ſame, or having a great Reſemblance in Sound or Signification to one another, are very frequently and in the ſame Rule repeated. It were eaſy to ſhew this in a great many Examples; but I ſhall content my ſelf with a few. Thus, *p.* 5. *Rule* 10. in four Lines we have *hic* or *hæc* ſeven Times repeated, and that interchangeably almoſt the one after the other, *viz.* in the firſt Line, *hæc* and *hic*; in the ſecond, *hic* and *hæc*; in the third, *hæc* and *hic*, and *hic* again in the fourth. Now, among ſo many *hic*'s and *hæc*'s, ſo variouſly diſpoſed in this Rule, how difficult is it for a Boy, in committing them to Memory, to make every one of them keep his own Place, and not to ſubſtitute one in the

oom of another? And if this should happen, which is not easily o be avoided, this Rule shall prove no Rule at all. For should he epeat the second Line, for Instance, *Hæc* IO *corporeum signans, hic* alo caroque, his Rule would be quite contrary to what it ought to e. If it be said, that their being plac'd alternately, *mas*; *hæc*, *hic*; ic, *hæc*; *hæc*, *hic*, will direct him: I answer, That in many of his ules this does not hold; and supposes, contrary to what he designs y this Method, that the Boy should consider the Connexion of one art of his Rule with another. Again, how nauseous is the Repeti- on of the Word *mas* four Times in the Space of five Lines *R.* 18.? nd the same is to be said of the Word *hæc* seven Times in five Lines, . 20.; and *hic*, *hæc* or *hoc*, sixteen Times in *R.* 25. in half that lumber of Lines. In like manner, it cannot but be ungrateful to very well tun'd Ear, to meet with the same Syllables frequently re- eated, as *bris* thrice, *tris* and *oris* twice in *R.* 26. *p.* 20.; and after- ards *etis* six Times in *R.* 28. So *uris* and *uris* *R.* 34.; *dis*, *dis*, *dis*, . 38.; *gis*, *gis*, *gis*, *R.* 40. See the same disagreeable Repetitions f *im*, *R.* 42. of *e* and *i*, *R.* 45, 46, 47 and 48. of *um* and *ium*, . 50 and 51. If these and such like pass with our Author for Poe- ical Beauties, it is hard to judge wherein Deformity consists. It ere better, in my Opinion, to have no Verse-Rules at all, than such these, that are not only harsh and troublesome to the Ear to a ve- high Degree, but also, instead of assisting the Memory, as is pre- nded, do very much embarass and confound it, by the frequent Re- etition of the same or similar Words close upon one another.

§ 14. I proceed to *another* Advantage (for I am content that what have already mentioned should be accounted but *one*) which *T. R.*'s rammar hath above that of Mr. *Trotter*; and that is, that in *T. R.*'s very thing is carried on in a regular and distinct Order, than which othing seems more necessary in Teaching; whereas in Mr. *Trotter*'s, things of different Kinds and Natures are blended and confounded ogether. Thus, for the sake of his beloved, or rather affected Bre- ity, he hath all along mixed and jumbled his irregular Nouns to- ether with the regular; and that very often in a very irregular Man- er: For who would expect to find the Irregularity of the Declen- on of *Elysium*, *cælum*, *&c.* under the Rule for the Gender of Nouns n *UM*, *p.* 6. which ought rather to have come in under the Rules or the second Declension? If it be said, That they are placed there pon the account of the Change of their Gender in the plural Num- er; it will be answered, That that Change is occasioned by the Change of their Termination in that Number, or rather that they f old had their singular in *US*. But whatever is in that, he cannot se that Pretence for *ergo* in the same Rule, or *feminis* in the next, ordis, *ambage* and *compede* in *R.* 18. *p.* 7 & 8. the Irregularity of

theſe not being owing to any Change in their Terminations. The ſame may be ſaid of *opis*, *ſpontis*, *dapis*, *R.* 24. and of *precis*, *dicis*, *vicis*, *necis* and *frugis*, *R.* 25. *p.* 10. But, not to inſiſt further on this, it cannot but breed Confuſion in the Head of the Scholar, to blend Things of ſo very different Kinds, as regular and irregular Nouns are, together, contrary to the Practice of all or moſt Grammarians that went before him.

§ 15. A *third* Advantage that *T. R.*'s Grammar hath above Mr. *Trotter*'s is, that throughout the Preterites and Supines of Verbs, the Compounds are generally taken notice of as well as the Simples: A Method, which, though quite neglected by Mr. *Trotter*, yet Mr. *Monro*, for all his being otherwiſe a great Compendizer, thought fit to follow; and is of great Uſe to Boys, both as it furniſhes them with a larger Field for Practice, and alſo gives them an agreeable Idea of that almoſt infinite Variety of Verbs, which the *Latin* Tongue is by that Fund of Compoſition ſtock'd withal; not to mention, that they are thereby enabled in a great meaſure to trace their various Significations up to the firſt Original, and to diſcover a beautiful Analogy between theſe and the Significations which Cuſtom afterwards has ſtampt upon them.

§ 16. A *fourth* Advantage of *T. R.*'s Grammar above Mr. *Trotter*'s is the great Number of Examples given in each Rule, eſpecially in the *Syntactical*, *i. e.* the chief Part of it, in which Mr. *Trotter* is more ways than one deficient. For, *1ſt*, his Examples are very few, and ſometimes none at all: As in *R.* 9. § 3. *R.* 23. § *ult.* *R.* 27. § 2 & 3. *R.* 29. § 4. *R.* 42. § *ult.* *R.* 63. § 2. *R.* 72. § 3. *R.* 76. § 4, 7 *&* *ſeqq.* *2dly*, His Examples are too much taken out of Poetical Writers, whereas *T. R.* hath a due Mixture of both, and theſe generally containing a moral or elegant Sentence, apt to be imprinted on the Memory, and worthy to be retain'd in it on more Conſiderations than one. That Mr. *Trotter*'s is much inferior to the other in this reſpect alſo, is obvious to any one that compares them together. 'Tis true, that *T. R.*'s Performance has by the great Number of theſe Examples ſwell'd to a greater Bulk than theſe Compendium-makers will allow or approve of. But I do maintain, as he has managed the Affair, they are of ſingular Uſe and Advantage. For, tho' it is a received Maxim, That dry Precepts, *i. e.* without Examples, make but little Impreſſion; and that nothing tends more to fix what is taught upon the Memory, than the ſhewing the Uſe of it by Practice and Application: ſo it muſt neceſſarily follow, that a competent Number of ſuch Examples muſt have a mighty Influence in Grammar Learning; for thereby the Scholar ſees, as it were, the Rule ſet before his Eyes, and put into ſuch a clear Light, that he cannot well miſtake it. For this Reaſon it was, that *T. R.* not think

ng one sufficient to his purpose, has generally illustrated every Rule nd Observation with three Examples; that by the Frequency of hem, and the taking notice of the exact Harmony betwixt them and he Rule, it may be imprinted on the Mind with the greater Force nd Durableness, and the Learner be thereby more and more accuomed to apply such a Rule, when his Occasions shall call for it.

§ 17. I know it will be said, That the mandating so many Exaples will take up a great deal of that Time that ought to be employed n reading the Authors. But I answer, in the *1st* Place, There is oom enough for both, without encroaching the one upon the other, when the Matter is rightly managed by a prudent Teacher. But *2dly*, As these Examples are generally choice Sentences taken out of the best of those Authors, it may very well be said, that the Scholar, in earning them, is learning so much of those Authors, and, together with that, the Art of applying and imitating them.

§ 18. To put this Matter in a yet clearer Light, because too may are apt to be imposed upon in it, I would have it carefully to be here considered, that the main Scope of the Scholar is the acquiring of the Language; and that in this View, all the other Knowledge he may obtain in the reading of Authors is in a manner but an accidental Accession or By-improvement in comparison of this his principal Design. All the other Improvement and Knowledge which an be had from those Authors, he may have from Books writ in is own or other Languages: But the *Latin* Tongue is only to be cquired from the reading of *Latin* Books, as such; and from none none directly and immediately than those that *ex professo* both teach nd exemplify the Rules of speaking it. To be more particular, I would fain ask these Gentlemen, who talk so much of the Reading of he *Latin* Authors, with the Neglect of the Rules according to which hat Language was spoken and used by them, what it is they propose to the Learner by such Reading. Is it the Knowledge of the Things they treat of, such as *History*, *Antiquity*, *Mythology*, *Geometry*, or any other useful Art or Science? If so, they may save hemselves and their Pupils a great deal of Drudgery and Labour; since all or most of these things can be acquired to as great Perfection, and with an incomparably greater Facility, in their own native Language. If it be said, That these things, as delivered by those ncient Writers, are more beautifully and agreeably conveyed to our Minds in the original Language in which they were written, than hey can be in any other; I grant it: But then I ask again, whence his Beauty and Agreeableness doth proceed? Is it not from somehing in the Language itself, which is very much impaired, if not ltogether lost, when transfused into another Channel? If this is he Case, as certainly it is, and that the Beauties with which we are

ſo much delighted and charmed in thoſe ancient Writings, are eſ-
ſentially inherent in, and inſeparable from the Language uſed by
the Authors of them, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that we cannot
have any tolerable Perception of thoſe Beauties, and the Pleaſure
reſulting from it, without a competent Knowledge of the Language
itſelf. And how can this be attained, without underſtanding in ſome
good meaſure that Copiouſneſs, Variety, Harmony, Sweetneſs, and
the like, which are to be found in it? that is, in other Words, with-
out underſtanding the Genius of the Language, the various Inflexi-
ons and Changes of its Words, the manifold Ways of ranging and
placing them in Sentences? And this is that which we call *Gram-
mar*; without an adequate Knowledge whereof, as we cannot well
diſcover the Meaning of thoſe Authors, ſo far leſs can we diſcern
the Beauties of them. I am aware, that here it will be ſaid, That
the choiceſt of theſe Beauties belong to another Art, *viz. Oratory*.
That *Oratory* hath a great Share in them, is not denied: But then,
as Oratory itſelf depends very much on Grammar, and neceſſarily
preſuppoſes it as its Foundation, as all Writers on that Art do agree,
the Matter muſt ſtill come to the ſame Iſſue. For if Oratory is no-
thing elſe but a beautiful Superſtructure raiſed upon Grammar, it
muſt follow, that the more extenſive, firm and ſolid this Foundation
is, ſo much the larger, ſtronger and ſurer Ground there is for that
fine Superſtructure.

§ 19. I Had written thus far, in anſwer to the common Topicks in-
ſiſted on againſt large and comprehenſive Grammars, (ſuch as
that of *T. R.* is) and for the Uſe of ſhort and compendious ones, before
I had ſeen Mr. *Clarke*'s new Grammar of the *Latin* Tongue; in the
Preface whereof, as well as in ſome other Treatiſes lately publiſhed
by him, (which I had not much regarded) he not only oppoſes the
Uſe of large Grammars, but alſo brings the Rules of that Art with-
in a narrower Compaſs than almoſt any that went before him. And
therefore, though he has ſaid little upon that Head, but what was
advanced formerly by others, and I have in a good meaſure already
refuted; yet becauſe he has had the good luck of getting a more
than ordinary Reputation in theſe Matters, and that his Arguments
may notwithſtanding ſeem to ſtand in full Force, unleſs a formal and
direct Reply be made them: I have thought it proper, for the Read-
er's greater Satisfaction, to conſider particularly whatever looks like
Reaſoning from that Author on this Subject. And, ſo far as I can
trace his Arguments, they may be reduced to theſe two.

1. That a great Part of theſe large Grammars is taken up with
Things of very rare and uncommon Uſe. And,

2. That the long Time that muſt be employed in learning them
will

ill justle out other more valuable Things that Boys ought to be ught at School.

Though I have pretty fully above removed both these Objections, et I shall here again resume the Consideration of them, without ncealing any thing of that Strength which Mr. *Clarke*'s own Words n give them.

§ 20. 1. To begin with the First: In his aforesaid Preface, *p.* 10. e tells us, "That the Design of Grammar is to facilitate the Read- ing and Writing or Speaking of a Language. Now *(says he)* there are a great many things within the Compass of a *Latin* Grammar of very rare and uncommon Use, and so of very little or no Significancy at all to either of the two mentioned Purposes, and which therefore it would be very impertinent to trouble Youth with. Accordingly *(he adds)* that he has dropt all this Stuff, as foreign to his Purpose." These things he above, and in his *Essay on Education*, *p.* 108. calls *useless Niceties and insignificant Punctilios*; and *ibid. p.* 110. "That they are hardly worth the Trouble of charging the Memory with them." Nay, *p.* 112. he insinuates that they are more apt to do ill than good.

§ 21. To this I answer: 1*st*, That, even according to him, *Pref.* 8. "the whole of the *Latin* Grammar is a large Thing, far from being given us by any one Grammarian that we know of." Nay will own with *Quintilian*, that there are some things in Grammar *ua melius est nescire*. But that does by no means hinder, but that will require a pretty large Grammar to take in all those things hich are not of a *very rare and uncommon Use*. The *Latin* Tongue, I have often said, has a vast Variety in it: And this Variety does ot extend itself only to Things *very uncommon*, but also to Things pretty frequent Use, and in which the Beauty and Elegancy of the anguage does often consist. Is there no Medium then between hings necessary and essential, and Things *very rare and uncommon?* nd are their Boundaries and Landmarks so exactly adjusted, that ere is no passing the Lines of what is *most useful and substantial* Grammar, as he expresses it *p.* 11. but we must immediately fall to *useless Niceties and insignificant Punctilios*? Mr. *Clarke* may as stly say, there is no Middle between Avarice and Prodigality, Cow- dice and Fool-hardiness, and the like. *Horace* (and all the World ill agree with him) was of another Mind, when he tells us,

> ——— *Non ego avarum*
> *Cum veto te fieri, vappam jubeo aut nebulonem.*
> *Est quiddam Tanaim inter, socerumque Viselli.*

§ 22. 2*dly*, What Mr. *Clarke* may reckon of *very rare and uncommon*

mon Uſe in the *Latin* Tongue, is not eaſy to determine: But, if his Grammar is to be the Standard, we have ſhewed already, and ſhall more fully ſhew afterwards, that he has taken in ſeveral Things into it, ſome whereof are *very uncommon*; ſuch as *adventi, fructi, ornati, quæſti, tumulti, p.* 5. *burdo, p.* 8. *trudes, tudes, p.* 9. *retis, rops, urpix, p.* 10. *glos, prolubium, algu, pecu, nauco, p.* 13. *mactus ſordis, induviæ, multitia, p.* 14. Some altogether unprecedented, *hyemum, p.* 4. *duernio, p.* 8. *Averni, ſupellectilia*, plural, *p.* 12. *la, capiſtri, fili*, plural, and *ducentum, p.* 13. *amaminor, docemino legiminor, audiminor, p.* 43 & 44. Again, he has left out many thing of very common and ordinary Uſe; ſuch as the Genders of *vulg* and *pelagus*; of *carbo, mucro, [illegible], pulmo, temo, umbo*; of *crin ignis, panis*; of *ſilex, cortex, obex*; of *lien, ren, ſplen, delphin, c non*, and ſeveral others mentioned above, *p.* 7. But theſe are Trifl in compariſon of his general and avowed Omiſſions: ſuch as, t Formation of the Genitives of Nouns of the third Declenſion; t Manner of comparing of *dexter, citer, exter, poſterus, ſuperus, in rus, maturus, nuperus, vetus, &c.*; the various Diviſions of Nou (and for the moſt part of Verbs) with reſpect to their Signification Derivations, Compoſitions, *&c.*; all the Grammatical Figures, e ther Etymological or Syntactical; not to mention Orthography a Proſody, the firſt of which he will ſay is to be learn'd by Practic and that the ſecond belongs not to Grammar, but to Poeſy. Na had he been allowed to follow his own ſuperior Judgment, he wou likewiſe have omitted the *Heteroclite* Nouns and *Preterites* of Verb For, *p.* 15. of his Preface, he tells us, " he was once minded to ha " omitted them both; but was determined otherwiſe, for fear of g " ving Offence to weak Readers, who might have thought ſuch " Omiſſion in a Grammar a grand Defect, and very juſt Matter " Exception againſt it." How much his weak Readers will becom either ſtronger or wiſer by all that he has ſaid on theſe two Head I leave to themſelves to judge: One thing I am pretty confident that there are not a few Readers, of as great Abilities as himſelf, wh will think the Omiſſion, not only of thoſe, but of the other thing I have mentioned, a *grand Defect* in his Grammar, and a *juſt Matt of Exception againſt it.* Nay I further affirm, that if all theſe things which he in his ſingular Wiſdom has thought fit to overlook, are t paſs for Things of *very rare and uncommon Uſe*, there is little in t Language that deſerves to be called *common*: And if a Gramma that wants theſe, can facilitate or render the Speaking of it eas there is vaſtly leſs Difficulty in the *Latin* Tongue than moſt Peop hitherto imagined. And yet our learned Author, in his *Eſſay* a *Education, p.* 36. acknowledges, " That the bringing Boys to a " *Latin* Stile (which he ſays, *Pref. p.* 10. it is the Deſign of Gramm

to facilitate) is really Matter of great Difficulty, and the greatest of all Difficulties the Master hath upon his Hands."

These things seem aukwardly to hang together: For if the chief tention of School Education is, to bring Boys, as far as they are pable, to a *true Latin Stile*; and if Grammar was always thought prime Instrument and Means for furthering that Intention; it looks mewhat odd to think that a Grammar, so many ways lame and de-tive in Things necessary to the acquiring such a Stile, should not ly be thought a fit and proper one, but, in his Conceit, the fittest d propereſt hitherto published.

§ 23. But here he thinks he has an excellent Evasion: For, *p.* 3. the same *Essay*, he tells us, "That this Difficulty lies not in Mat-ters of Grammar, but in the making choice of proper Words, and such fit Phrases or Forms of Expression as are used by the *Roman* Classicks."

I very readily confess, that the chief Difficulty lies in these. But is no less true, that a great Part of that Difficulty may be removed the Assistance of Grammar: For by it the Learner will be inform-, that a great many Words, which, for ought he otherwise knew, ght be used in these Phrases, are therefore improper, because ei-r not used by those Classicks at all, or not used in such a Manner he might fancy they could: Which it is the Design of some Parts his Grammar to teach him. Now, though (I own) there are a eat Number of Instances, in which Grammar can give him little no Help, with respect to the right Choice of Words or Phrases; t if there are a great many other Instances wherein it can, as in Things above mentioned omitted by him, I would fain know at should hinder him from taking the Benefit of such Assistance. Mr. *Clarke* will not allow this, but will have all these things left the Boy's own Observation, I do not see what great Use he has any Grammar at all, since it is possible (nay there are several amples of it upon Record) that a good Genius with great Assi-ty may acquire other things, as well as these, without it; and ere these Qualifications are wanting, I know no Method in the orld that will succeed. But the Question is not here, What may done? but, What is fittest to be done? *i. e.* Whether a Student that Language should work it out by the mere Force of Observa-n and Practice; or whether he should, together therewith, take Advantage of such Rules and Directions as those learned in it ve furnished him with, and which, if duly attended to, will very ch facilitate his Labour, and make it shorter than otherwise it uld be? This Mr. *Clarke* himself seems to be sensible of: For his *Essay*, *p.* 106. he leaves his great Director Mr. *Locke*, (who uld have *Latin* to be learn'd by Use only,) and prefers the learn-

ing

ing of it by Grammatical Rules; which, though the other Way ma
do in private Education, he thinks abſolutely neceſſary in School
Nay, *p.* 107. he tells us, what is very true, "That even in the learn
"ing of Languages by Uſe, the Mind makes its Way by the Hel
"of Rules, which the frequent Obſervation it is unavoidably pu
"upon, naturally ſuggeſts to it; and that therefore all Langua
"are learn'd by Rules which the Mind is obliged to make for itſel
"And indeed *(he ſays)* it is impoſſible for him to conceive how an
"Language can be got otherwiſe. And *(adds he)* if this be th
"Caſe, it muſt be a vaſt Advantage to any body, in the learning o
"a Language, to have plain eaſy Rules laid before him in due Me
"thod, and thereby be eaſed of the Trouble of hammering ou
"Rules for himſelf in a bungling Manner, after an Expence of Tim
"and continual Obſervation." Thus far all is well: But as the Fa
vour ſeems to be granted with a narrow and ſtingy Hand, he im
mediately takes back a great Part of what he had given. For, *p.*
108. he will have the Grammar that is to furniſh us with ſuch Rul
to be a very *compendious* one; and, *p.* 109. that it ought to contai
little elſe but *the moſt ſubſtantial and neceſſary Things*, which he ſay
are *chiefly* (*i. e.* according to him, almoſt *only*) *to be look'd after*
and taken care of. But pray, why ſhould this Grammar be ſo ve
ry *compendious?* and why to conſiſt only of *the moſt ſubſtantial an*
neceſſary Things? (though his, I think, does not ſo much as contai
all theſe.) For, if a great Number of other things, beſides thoſ
that are *moſt ſubſtantial and neceſſary*, muſt be known to a Boy, b
fore he can be brought to a *true Latin Stile*; why may he not tak
the Aſſiſtance alſo of Grammar Rules for learning of theſe, rath
than, *with a great Expence of Time and continual Obſervation, be ob*
ged to hammer them out to himſelf in a bungling Manner, i. e. as I u
derſtand theſe Words, in ſuch a Manner, that he is not very ſu
whether he is right or wrong. The general Argument he mak
uſe of will equally hold for both: For, where Rules can be h
for any thing that is requiſite for the forming of a *true Latin Sti*
and theſe Rules are much ſurer to truſt to, and can be acquir
with leſs Expence of Time, than ſuch as the Boy's own Obſervati
can hammer out for him; who can doubt whether he ſhould t
the Benefit of thoſe Rules or no, unleſs he who will ſay, that U
certainty is preferable to Certainty, and that it is better to loſe Ti
than ſave it?

§ 24. Ay, but he affirms over and over, that all theſe things a
but *Grammatical Niceties* and *Punctilios*, of *very rare and uncom*
mon Uſe, and *of little or no Significancy to the writing of true* Lat
Who told him ſo? Is there, as I ſaid before, no Medium betwe
the moſt *ſubſtantial* and *neceſſary* Things of a Language, and

idle *Niceties* and *Punctilios* of it? Are there not many things, which though less substantial and necessary, yet pretty frequently occur in good Authors, and therefore are very fit to be known to any that would bring themselves to a true *Latin* Stile? To be more particular, Is the Knowledge of the Gender of *vulgus*, *pelagus*, *mucro*, *pugio*, *ignis*, *panis*, and many such like Nouns mentioned above, a Grammatical *Nicety*? Is it a trifling *Punctilio*, to know that *iter* hath in its Genitive *itineris*, not *iteris*; *robur*, *roboris*, not *roburis*; *turtur*, *turturis*, not *turtoris*; *stipes*, *stipitis*, not *stipis*; *rupes*, *rupis*, not *rupitis*; *lis*, *litis*, not *liris*; *glis*, *gliris*, not *glitis*; *pectus*, *pectoris*, not *pecteris*; *latus*, *lateris*, not *latoris*, and a great many such Genitives? that *exter* hath *extimus* or *extremus*, not *exterrimus*, and *vetus*, *veterrimus*, not *veterissimus*, *&c.*? In short, (for it would almost take a Grammar to go through them all,) is it of no Significancy, to one that would speak or write right *Latin*, to know whether he should say, *Memor nostrûm*, or *nostri*; *Miserere nostri*, or *nostrûm*; *Pater noster*, or *nostri*, or *nostrûm*, *&c.*? Or whether he may not say, *Non licet mihi esse negligenti*, as well as *negligentem*; and, *Vir ingenio truci*, as well, if not better, than *ingenii trucis*? For all which, and a great many more, I do not find the least Hint in Mr. *Clarke*'s Grammar. And what must be done for these? Must they all be left to the Scholar's Observation? Or will it *be sufficient*, as he tells us, *Essay*, *p.* 109. "that the Master take "notice of them to him as they happen to fall in his Lesson?" If so, our written Grammar is like to dwindle away to almost nothing, and the *Roman* Language, as well as Religion, is chiefly to be taught and kept up by oral Tradition. Who would have thought, that a Person so much offended with the Papists on smaller Accounts, should fall in with them in a Thing of more dangerous Consequence? He makes a hideous Out-cry against Grammars writ in *Latin*, and compares them to their Prayers in an unknown Tongue. But if our Grammar is to be so compendious as he would have it, (for he says, *Essay*, *p.* 29. "That all of that kind, besides the Declensions and "Conjugations, might be brought within the Compass of one single "Sheet of Paper, or two at the most; which would with Ease be "lodged in the Memory of a Child, of any tolerable Capacity, in "a Fortnight or three Weeks,") it is no great Matter what Language it is put into, whether *English* or *Latin*. But it is high Time to have done with this, and to proceed to,

II. Mr. *Clarke*'s second Pretence against the Use of large Grammars, which is, as he tells us in his Preface, *p.* 8 & 12. "That the "learning of such Grammars is inconsistent with the due Progress "of Youth in other things of a much greater Concern and Importance to them:" And, *Essay*, *p.* 109, "That a large and gene-

" ral Acquaintance with the Words and Phraſeology of the *Latin*
" Tongue, with the Rites and Cuſtoms of the old *Romans*, is of in-
" finitely more Importance than theſe," *i. e.* the *Niceties* and *Punctilios* of Grammar, in which Claſs he always comprehends whatever is not in his. And *p.* 11 *&* 12. of the ſame *Eſſay*, he is yet more particular, and tells us, that the things he would have eſpecially taught at School, with a Preference, it would ſeem, far above both *Latin* and *Greek*, are, *Hiſtory*, *Geography*, *Chronology*, and the moſt neceſſary and uſeful Things in *Divinity*, *&c.* And in this *&c.* he would perhaps have alſo contained *Politicks*, *Architecture*, the *Art military*, *Husbandry*, *Dancing*, *Fencing*, and the like: For it is certain, that ſomething of all theſe may, and a little of ſeveral of them ought to be taught at School. But then, what may be gathered of theſe from the *Latin* Authors the School-boys read, or even from ſome ſhort Introductions or Compends of them, that may be put into their Hands for that purpoſe, will not do the Buſineſs with him. For he immediately adds, " Theſe (*i. e. Hiſtory*, *Geography*, and the " other things he had mentioned) if a right Method was uſed with " them, might be taught them to a greater Degree of Perfection " than moſt Men of a Scholaſtick Education, that apply themſelves " to Reading, ever attain to." What this fine Method of his is we do not well know: But if it is to carry the Scholar *to a greater Degree of Perfection, than moſt Men that have had a Scholaſtick Education* (*i. e.* been bred at any other School than his) *can, by applying themſelves to Reading, ever attain to*; we may juſtly infer, that as it muſt be very full and particular, (the very Reverſe of that uſed in his Grammar,) ſo it muſt take up a great deal of Labour and Time. And that this is his Intention, we may further learn from this, that in this ſame *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 10. he would not have a Boy to leave the School till he was of the Age of ſixteen or ſeventeen. And in his *Eſſay upon Study*, *p.* 140. he not only tells us, " That in the " vulgar Method of Teaching, he ſees not how it is poſſible for a " Boy to be tolerably fitted for a College before the Age of eighteen " or nineteen;" but alſo, according to his own Method, and after all the vaſt Improvements he has made, he is poſitively of Opinion " That the Age of eighteen is the ſooneſt that any ſhould move " [to a College,] let his Parts and Attainments be what they will." Now, as he ſuppoſes, *Eſſay upon Study*, *p.* 18. that a Boy is capable to begin his *Latin* at eight Years of Age, and that by this Computation he muſt ſtay at School at leaſt ten Years, (nay that, as he there inſinuates *p.* 145. it would be the better for him, if he ſhould ſtay at School a Year or two longer,) one would think that either he has Time enough for learning the largeſt Grammar that is commonly taught, even though there ſhould happen to be ſome little *Nicet-*

nd *Punctilios* in it; or else that the greatest Part of it is to be em-
loyed another Way, that is, in learning *History*, *Geography*, and the
est above named. But if we add to this the great Improvements
his grand Reformer of Education fancies he has made in the Art of
Teaching, insomuch that, if we will take his Word for it, *Essay on
tudy*, *p.* 18 *&* 34. the Boy may, according to his Method, learn
everal things, especially the *Syntax*, (which is none of the easiest,)
n the third or fourth Part of that Time that was laid out upon them
y his dull Predecessors; nay the whole of his Grammar, as was be-
ore observed, be with Ease taught *in a Fortnight or three Weeks*: If
we add this, I say, that according to Mr. *Clarke*'s Scheme, the Learn-
ng of Languages, or *Words*, (as he contemptuously calls them,) is
he least Part of what Boys are to be taught at School; it plainly
ollows, that he would have the far greater Part of their Time to
e laid out, not upon the Language, but something else. And this
little less than what he himself expressly owns, *Essay upon Educ.*
. 11. where he tells us, "That he cannot but wonder, that when
it is evident that a great deal of useful Knowledge might be taught
Boys at the same time they learn the Languages, it should be so
little regarded, and the learning of *Words* made their *only Business*
during the best Part of their Lives."

§ 26. But to all this I answer: 1*st*, That no body, that I know
f, ever dream'd, far less intended, that the *learning of Words* (as he
xpresses it) should be the *only Business* of Boys at School. Nay the
hing is in itself impossible: For if these Boys are made but tole-
bly to understand the Authors they read, they must necessarily learn
omething of what is there treated of. And as *History* is the chief
ubject of most of them, they cannot fail to be instructed in that, as
ell as in the Language: And as the former is sooner acquired and
nore easily retain'd than the latter, it were well if they improved near
s much in the one as the other: And the like may be said of some
ther things. But if this will not satisfy Mr. *Clarke*, I shall readily
llow him, that after the Boy is somewhat advanced in his *Latin*,
ome small Portions of his Time, twice or thrice a-week, should be
et apart for his being taught the Elements of general *History*, *Geo-
raphy* and *Chronology*, the same Way as for *Writing*, *Arithmetick*
nd *Musick*. As for *Divinity*, though otherwise the most valuable
f all kind of Learning, it may be sufficient that he be taught the
undamental Principles and Precepts of it on the LORD's Day, or
ome select Hour the Day before or after, at the Master's Discretion,
with frequent Injunctions and Exhortations to the Practice of Virtue
nd true Goodness, and Animadversions on the contrary Behaviour.
But then, as there is none, I think, except Mr. *Clarke*, who expects
hat Boys, while at School, should be made Masters of these Arts and

Sciences; but that a general Knowledge of them, during that Space, is ſufficient for their purpoſe: I can by no means allow, that any conſiderable Part of their Time, the main Bulk whereof is deſtin'd for another End, ſhould be laid out upon them.

§ 27. For, *2dly*, Whatever Mr. *Clarke*'s Thoughts may be, I was always of Opinion, and ſo I believe are moſt Men that know any thing of Literature, that at Schools the learning of Languages was the firſt and principal Deſign, and that all other things were but acceſſory and By-improvements in compariſon of it. Not that I would have theſe other things to be ſlighted or neglected, ſo far as the Study of them does not interfere with *that* the Boy's main Buſineſs: But to invert the Order of Things, and to make that principal, which ought only at preſent to be but acceſſory, or the contrary, is what no Man of Senſe will think fit to be done. I would not here be miſunderſtood, as if my Meaning were, that the Knowledge of Words is abſolutely and in itſelf preferable to that of Things. No truly: All that I intend is, that as the Knowledge of a great many Things cannot be well attain'd without the previous Knowledge of Languages, (or, as Mr. *Clarke* will have it, of *Words*;) ſo, if ever we would attain the Knowledge of ſuch Things, we muſt firſt ſet about the Knowledge of thoſe Languages, which are in our Opinion the neceſſary Means of coming to ſuch a Knowledge: And, as hitherto we have only a general Notion of the Things to the Knowledge whereof theſe Languages are to bring us; ſo all the while the Knowledge of theſe Languages muſt be our chief Aim, and the former as yet is to be no otherwiſe regarded than as Motives and Incitements to prompt us forward to the Attainment of the latter. But why ſhould I ſpend more Words in a Caſe ſo plain, and which Mr. *Clarke* himſelf ſeems elſewhere to be ſatisfied about? For, *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 71. he quotes his great Patron Mr. *Locke*; who, arguing againſt the making Declamations at School, uſes among others this Argument, 'That the Buſineſs of a Boy's being ſent thither is Language barely, 'and not Invention:' And *p.* 76. 'That improving and perfecting 'him in the *Latin* Tongue is his proper [*i. e.* chief and principal] 'Buſineſs at School.'

§ 28. But *3dly*, Mr. *Clarke* furniſhes us with a very forcible Topick againſt his own Scheme: For in his *Eſſay upon Study*, *p.* 35. he juſtly repreſents *the aiming at too much, and aſpiring to a maſterly Skill in all the ſeveral Parts of Learning*, to be a great *Fault in the Conduct of Study*; and is at a great deal of Pains to ſhew the Folly, as well as Impracticableneſs of ſuch a Project. And in his *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 57. he complains of *the putting Boys on too many ſeveral Things at the ſame Time*. Now, if the putting of Boys at School on the Purſuit of *ſo much uſeful Knowledge*, (as he expreſſes

reſſes it, *p.* 11.) and bringing them *to ſuch a Degree of Perfection*, in *Hiſtory, Geography, Chronology, Divinity, &c. as very few Men of Scholaſtick Education, that apply themſelves to Reading, ever attain to*, (as by his Method, *p.* 8. he ſays may, and ought to be done;) do not ſee how he can avoid the Fault he here condemns. For how can the Study of ſo many things of very different Natures, and the carrying them to ſuch a Degree of Perfection as he ſpeaks of, conſiſt (I ſhall not ſay with one another, but) with that great and conſtant Application that is to be given to Languages, which is the Scholar's *proper* and *chief Buſineſs*, and the attaining a competent Skill whereof is, by his own Confeſſion, *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 36. *the greateſt of all Difficulties the Maſter* (and, I may add, the Scholar himſelf) *has upon his Hands?* And here I may very juſtly report upon Mr. *Clarke*, what he in his *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 143. ſays of Boys that are ſet off to the Univerſity *without any tolerable Knowledge of the Languages*, "That the Conſequence is, that their Tutors are obliged to uſe them like School-boys, by making them ſpend a great deal of their Time in the reading *Latin* and *Greek* Authors, which ought to be ſpent upon the Sciences. Thus their proper Buſineſs (*adds he*) in the College is jumbled together with what properly belongs to a Grammar-School, [*Here he owns what I ſaid above,*] and ſhould have been done there. By which means it comes to paſs, that they have more Irons in the Fire at a time, than they can poſſibly manage; are engaged in a Variety of Purſuits all together, to the breeding of great Confuſion, and to the intolerable Hindrance of their Proficiency in Knowledge; ſo intolerable, that ſuch can never make much out, I am ſure; but muſt needs come away from a College, though they were not idle there, very little wiſer than they went." Thus Mr. *Clarke* (and I agree with him) very rationally obſerves. But let him turn the Tables, and apply this to his Scheme of School-Education. For if the Learning of ſo many Arts and Sciences, and that to ſuch a Degree of Perfection too as he promiſes, at a Grammar-School, can ſtand with the acquiring but of a tolerable Knowledge of the *Latin* and *Greek* Tongues; why may not the learning of thoſe Tongues, at leaſt ſo much of them as will ſerve their Purpoſe there, conſiſt with the Learning of ſuch Sciences as are taught at Univerſities? There is no more Incongruity in the one than the other: For if the latter will embaraſs and juſtle out the Sciences, ſo will the former do the Languages; and if the ſecond is turning an Academy into a Grammar-School, the firſt is turning a Grammar-School into an Academy. The Abſurdity and Prepoſterouſneſs of both are very great, but lies heavieſt againſt Mr. *Clarke*'s Scheme: For ſome of the Sciences that are taught at Univerſities may be, and too often are taught from other

ther Authors than *Latin* or *Greek* ones; but theſe Languages are on-
ly to be learn'd from their own Authors, which no Tranſlations,
Mr. *Clarke's* not excepted, can ſupply the Place of. And this brings
me naturally to what I was to ſuggeſt in the laſt Place, for over-
throwing his ſecond Plea againſt the Uſe of large Grammars, name-
ly, That the learning of ſuch Grammars is *inconſiſtent with the Pro-
greſs of Youth in other things of much greater Concern and Importance
to them.* And that is,

§ 29. *4thly*, That if this Doctrine of Mr. *Clarke's* ſhall prevail, it
will, notwithſtanding all the fine Things he at other times ſays of
theſe learned Languages, create a general Diſtaſte of them with a
great many People; which, as it is too much the Caſe already, ſo pro-
bably has its Riſe from the ſame Fountain. For if either Men or Boys
ſhall give into an Opinion, that there are other things of an incom-
parably higher Value than Languages to be learned at School, and
that it would ſeem, by Mr. *Clarke's* curtailing and bringing into a
ſmall Compaſs the Grammars that are deſigned for teaching theſe
Languages, that he would have their chief Care employed upon theſe
other things; they will be eaſily tempted to ſlight and neglect the
Languages themſelves, and turn their Minds chiefly on what he tells
them is *of vaſtly greater Importance.* But if it is further ſuggeſted,
That theſe other Studies are pleaſant and agreeable, and that, on the
contrary, in learning theſe Languages there is nothing but Briers
and Thorns before them, and a ſlaviſh Drudgery and extreme Dif-
ficulty perpetually accompanying them; they will be on the Point of
loſing all Heart towards them, and of giving up entirely with them
for ever. And it will be no ſmall Inducement to them ſo to do,
when they are moreover made to believe, that theſe Arts and Scien-
ces he talks of (which have not, as the Languages, a borrowed Va-
lue, but a true and intrinſick one of their own) can be come at in a
much eaſier Way, *viz.* by their being delivered in their own Mo-
ther-tongue. For if once they can be perſuaded of this, there is no
avoiding the Conſequence, but that theſe Languages muſt paſs for
vain Amuſements, and be thought of as little Significancy to uſeful
and ſubſtantial Knowledge, as the long and perplex'd Grammars that
teach them. That theſe things which I have ſaid are not idle Fan-
cies of my own Contrivance, but the real Sentiments of a great ma-
ny, and thoſe otherwiſe Perſons of Diſtinction and good Senſe, is
too evident from daily Experience to be doubted of: And to this
chiefly is to be aſcribed the great Neglect of the *Latin* Tongue pre-
ſently to be obſerved in *Britain* and ſome other Countries. But who
would have expected, that a publick Teacher of that Language ſhould
ſo far chime in with an Opinion which wants but a Step or two to
render his Employment altogether uſeleſs? For when the *Latin*

Tongue

Tongue comes to be thought so, both Grammar and Grammar-Schools must go a packing with it. All the flourishing Speeches and high Encomiums he elsewhere bestows upon that Language will be to little purpose: For so long as People are persuaded that it is of small Value in comparison of other things that are to be taught at School, and that those other things can be got without it, they will not any more think it worth while to lay out their Time upon a Study that is no less unnecessary than laborious. But, as if People were not apt enough of themselves to take up with that which will cost them the least Trouble, Mr. *Clarke* has thought fit to give them a new Handle and Encouragement to it: For in the *Dissertation upon Language* which he has subjoined to his new Grammar, *p.* 178 *& seqq.* he is at a great deal of Pains to shew, that because the modern Fashions and Ways of Life are vastly different from what they were in the Time of the old *Romans*, and we have got a great Variety of Arms offensive and defensive unknown to them, and the like, therefore the *Latin* Tongue *is become utterly improper to answer our present Occasions*; and consequently, that it is by no means fit for being a *common* or *universal Language* to the learned World; and that *English*, *French* or *Italian* are vastly more proper for that purpose. And then he adds, "That one great Advantage arising from pitching upon one of our modern Languages would be, that whereas our Youth are now all *teized* and *plagued* with learning to speak or write *Latin*, and to very little purpose, by reason of the great Difficulty of it, arising in part from the Cause just mentioned, they would be eased of that Trouble." He *wonders that this has not been more taken notice of*; and I wonder no less, that a Professor of that Language should say so much to the Disparagement of it, and which, if there were Place for it here, I could prove in a great measure to be false. There is only one Thing I shall take notice of, namely, That this Doctrine of his does very ill quadrate with what he speaks, *Essay upon Educ. p.* 123. concerning a Project that was set on Foot some Years ago, of publishing a Weekly News-paper in *Latin*, under the Tittle of *Mercurius Romanus*; which he not only approves of, but seems sorry that it was laid aside: For I hardly know any thing more difficult to be done in that Language, than the occurrences related in such Papers.

But whether Mr. *Clarke*'s Sentiments on this Head are just or otherwise, I am sure that the whole learned World two hundred Years ago (and I hope some of the most judicious of them continue to this Day) were of another Mind. At that time, and long after, it was the universal settled Opinion, that almost all Knowledge was lock'd up in these learned Languages, and that there was no coming at it, but in and through them: And this necessary and inseparable

Con-

Connexion which they thought was between them, made them p
almoſt an equal Value upon both. But beſides the *utile* or *Profit*
be reap'd from thoſe Languages, as being in their Account the onl
ſure Channels through which all uſeful Learning did and ſhould r
they alſo had a great Regard to the *dulce* or *Pleaſure* to be found
them: For they obſerved, and as it were felt, ſuch intrinſick Exc
lencies in them, ſuch Variety and Copiouſneſs, ſuch a charming M
calneſs and other Beauties in the noble Authors that wrote and ſpo
them, as no modern Language whatſoever can poſſibly equal, or e
come near to. Being animated by theſe Conſiderations, they thou
no Pains too great, no Difficulties too hard, no Grammars too
dious, that would at laſt make them Maſters of ſo valuable a Pr
This, among innumerable others, was the Opinion of our great
chanan; who, *Hiſt. Scot. lib.* 1. *cap.* 8. has theſe Words, *Quod*
me attinet, malim ignorare veterem illam & anilem priſcorum
tannorum balbutiem, (and probably he would have ſaid the ſame
any other modern Language, except ſo much as was neceſſary
common Life, in his own,) *quàm dediſcere quodcunque hoc eſt ſer*
nis Latini, quod magno cum labore puer didici. And a little after,
quid operâ & induſtriâ poſſimus, id omne eò conferamus, ut lingu
Græcam & Latinam, quas orbis pars melior tanquam publicas rec
pro viribus expoliamus. And, though it may paſs for a poetical
ggeration in what is ſaid by the now deſpis'd Mr. *Lilly*,

Addiſcas veterum clariſſima ſcripta virorum,
Et quos Auctores turba Latina docet;

and, after naming *Terence*, *Cicero* and *Virgil*,

Quos qui non didicit, nil præter ſomnia vidit:

Yet at the bottom it has ſomething of Truth in it, and was the
the main the generally received Opinion. How different from
is Mr. *Clarke*'s Conduct, who is at a great deal of Pains to diſpar
his own Art, and to ſhew that comparatively there is but ſmall
for it! And though he ſays, *Diſſert. on Lang. p.* 181. that he wo
not have the *Latin* Tongue to be quite laid aſide, but would ha
ſtill to be a Language for Scholars; yet, as he would not have Yo
any longer to be tormented about the writing or ſpeaking of it,
Conſequence will ere long be, that even ſuch will but little reg
it. And when that comes to paſs, (which he is haſtning as faſt
he can,) the Queſtion will not then be, Whether a ſhort or a lo
one? but, Whether any *Latin* Grammar at all ſhall be made uſe

SEC

SECT. II.

The vulgar Practice of teaching Latin, by a Grammar writ in the same Language, justified and defended.

§ 1. HAVING thus far accounted for the Length of *T. R.'s* Grammar, and shewed, I hope, to the Conviction of all intelligent and unprejudiced Masters of that Art, that the Complaints raised against it on that Score are unjust and groundless; I come now to the *Second* Branch of my Undertaking, which was to defend it against another Set of Adversaries, who would have it, and all others of its Kind, exploded upon another Head, *viz. Its being composed in* Latin, *the very Language it is designed to teach.*

This Objection against the vulgar Practice of teaching *Latin* in its own Language, has been raised many Years ago by several Persons of Distinction, such as the Author of the *Nouvelle Methode*, the famous Mr. *Locke*, and others; but by none in such a fierce and pedagogical Manner, as by the above named Mr. *John Clarke* Schoolmaster of *Hull*, in the *Preface* to his *new Latin Grammar*, published this same Year 1733. But I am hopeful, that when all things are duly weighed and considered, I shall be able, not only to vindicate the generally received Custom in this Particular, but also (notwithstanding all that Mockery and Ridicule to which Mr. *Clarke* would expose it) to shew, that the Method so strenuously contended for by him, will not so well answer the proposed Design. And that I may do this with the greater Perspicuity, I must premise these two Things.

1. That among all civilized Nations, where Learning and Humanity were in any Measure cultivated, the *Latin* Tongue, as it was once the Language of the greatest and most renowned People that ever was in the World, so it was always looked upon as the best, the most harmonious and expressive that ever was spoken; and upon that Account, as well as the many excellent Books writ in it, was judged the fittest for being the common Vehicle for transmitting the Learning of different Nations to one another, and keeping up a Correspondence among them; which could not so well be effected by any other Language whatsoever.

2. This being laid down for a Foundation, it was next considered, that, as this Language, however excellent in it self, was become what we call a dead one, as not being now spoken by any particular Nation in the World, and only to be acquired from the Books which are writ in it; the Knowledge of it would therefore become more difficult, and a great deal of Labour and severe Study would be necessary for the Attainment of such a Measure of it, as would be sufficient

ficient for the above mentioned Purpose. It could not fail moreover to be observed, that this Difficulty would be much increased by two other additional Causes, *viz.* 1*st*, The great Copiousness and Variety of the Language it self, far beyond any of the modern Languages in Use in our Part of the World. And 2*dly*, The vast Difference betwixt the Nature and Constitution of it, and that of any living Language we know of.

§ 2. These Things being rationally designed and supposed by the first Revivers of the *Latin* Tongue, and of all good Learning by its Means; their next Consideration would be, which was the most proper Method for acquiring such a Language, which tho' very difficult in it self, was yet for the Beauty and Usefulness of it, intended to be an universal one among learned Men, for keeping up a perpetual Intercourse among them, and thereby becoming an Instrument, as it were, of communicating their Knowledge to one another. And here it would naturally occur, that as Language in general is a practical Thing, chiefly attained by Imitation and Example: So the more of *Praxis* and Exercise should be used in the attaining of *this*, the more expeditious, full and perfect would the Knowledge of it be. Or, in other Words, as the easiest and readiest Way of acquiring any modern Language, is by living for some Time among, and conversing with that People to whom such a Language is vernacular: So they with good Reason thought, that for the acquiring of the *Latin*, a Method should be used, approaching as near as possible to that which is found the best for acquiring living Languages, *i. e.* by conversing as far as is practicable in *Latin*, and thereby endeavouring to make it, as it were, vernacular to us. For this Reason it was, that in most Schools and Colleges, it was an established Custom, that nothing but *Latin* should be spoken; and that Punishments or Mulcts should be imposed upon those that did otherwise. I know that this Practice is now much disused, and some learned Men have gone the Length altogether to condemn it: But in my Opinion without Reason. I shall not stay here to canvass this Point so fully as might otherwise perhaps be necessary. It shall suffice in the general to observe, that it is a Thing undeniable, that in former Times, when the Custom of speaking nothing but *Latin* in Schools was kept up, we had much better *Latin* Scholars, as well as Masters, than we have now. And there is the justest Reason in the World to expect it should be so, from the very Nature of the Thing it self. For Men, especially young ones, being naturally led to imitate what they hear or see done by others; and this Imitation being for the most Part perfected and made easy by the frequency of Acts, it will necessarily follow, that the more frequently we speak or write in any Language, we will gradually arrive at a greater Facility in that Language; and this

this Facility will at last render it almost habitual to us, as if it were our own Mother-tongue.

§ 3. The common Objection against this Practice is, That the accustoming Boys to speak *Latin*, before they can be supposed to have laid in a sufficient Stock of Vocables, far less of being Masters of the Rules of the Language, must necessarily make their Discourse nothing else but a confused Medley of Barbarisms and Solecisms, intolerable, if not unintelligible to true *Latin* Ears; and of so little Use with respect to the speaking of pure *Latin*, that it will require a double Task to set Things to Rights again; one of unlearning the barbarous Jargon they had been accustomed to, and another of teaching them pure *Latin* in its Place. This is the usual Argument against speaking *Latin* in Schools; which, tho' it may take with some People, yet in my humble Opinion, is of that Kind, which either proves too much, or nothing at all. For by the same Way of Reasoning it might be proved, that no Art either liberal or mechanical should be exercised, untill the Learner were made so perfect in the Theory, that he needed hardly to err when he came to the Practice. Nay it might hence be inferred, that no Language either native or foreign, should ever begin to be spoken: For if we are not to speak any Language till we are Masters of the Rules of it, I am afraid we shall never speak it at all; and that we shall at that Rate have not a Silence of five Years only, as the Disciples of *Pythagoras* are said to have had, but a perpetual one imposed upon us. Since therefore it would be absurd to follow that Course in any Thing else that depends upon Practice, and the gradual Improvements that result from it, it must be no less so in the *Latin* Tongue; wherein it is impossible that we can arrive at any tolerable Perfection, but by a constant Train of Exercises, either in speaking, or writing of *Latin*; and these carried on in such a Manner, that by the Assistance of a good Teacher, and diligently comparing our Performances with the Standard-rules or Authors of the Language, we may be daily enabled to correct what is amiss, and make farther and farther Advances in that Study. That this was judged the best Way of acquiring the *Latin* Tongue in former Times is beyond all Question; and as the Justness of the Means for attaining any End, is best known by Experience and Trial; so it is no less certain, that in Effect, while this Method was kept up, the greatest Masters for speaking and writing of *Latin* did flourish; and that now, since that Practice began to be disused, the Art of writing *Latin* is sensibly decayed, if not generally worn out. We have at present as great Divines, Lawyers, Physicians, Philosophers, Historians, *&c.* as in those Times: But how few are there now among us, if any, that can vie with *Erasmus*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Castalio*, *Budæus*, *Muretus*,

Cujacius, the two *Scaligers*, *Thuanus*, and our own *Buchanan*, *Wilson* and *Barclay*, with innumerable others in the two last Centuries, for that Purity and Fluency in writing *Latin*, which we find so conspicuous and admire in them? And to what Cause can this so remarkable Difference be ascribed, but to the different Method taken then from what is used now?

§ 4. But it will be farther objected, That this is to impose an *Egyptian* Task on young ones, and in effect to oblige them to make *Brick without Straw*. For how is it possible (will it be said) for them to speak a Language of which they are altogether ignorant? But this is a gross Misrepresentation of the Matter. For at their first setting out, it is neither required nor expected of young ones, that they should speak any *Latin* at all. But some time thereafter, when they have got the common Rules of Declension and Conjugation, and together with these have been taught some Vocables, and a few Phrases fit for their Purpose, they may by Degrees, be accustomed to speak such *Latin* as they are able; In which all along a tender Regard must be had to their yet weak Capacities, and great Allowances be made for the manifold Errors and Blunders they must, during this Noviceship, fall into. This, as I mentioned before, was the general Practice in Schools, from the Restauration of Learning in *Europe*, down to the Middle of the last Century at least, and in some Places to this Day. But then they did not stop here, but to prevent young ones from taking up with and indulging themselves in a rooted Habit of speaking barbarous *Latin*, besides the many other Helps contrived against that Evil, such as the *Phrase-books*, *School-Conferences*, and the like, writ by *Erasmus*, *Corderius*, *Vives*, and many others: Besides these, I say, they always took Care to make these three Things go hand in hand together. *First*, they gave them a *System* of *Grammar*, the Rules whereof, Lesson by Lesson, they explained to their Scholars, and obliged them to commit them, especially the more necessary ones, to Memory, with great Exactness. *Next*, and together with this, they prescribed them a Piece of a good *Latin* Author, to be rendred into English, or whatever was their native Language; in which they were not (as too many Masters are now) very nice about the Propriety or Elegancy of their own Tongue in the Translation. It was almost sufficient to them, that the Words and true Sense of the Author was throughly understood: For which Reason, their Expositions were as literal as was possible. But that which they chiefly studied, was to parse and construe every Sentence, and vary it to other similar Sentences; whereby, and by the making them constantly to observe all along the particular Genius of the Language, and the exact Conformity between their Authors and Grammar, they gradually prepared them for the

third

rd thing I was to mention: And that is the adding to these the I-
tation of what they were taught; which was performed two Ways,
, by obliging them (as I said) in the School at least, and among
emselves, to speak always in *Latin*, and *next*, by prescribing them
quent Exercises to be done by them in Writing; of turning some-
ng of *Latin* into their native Tongue, or from this to the *Latin*,
ecially the latter; in which great Care was taken to point out
ir Faults, and Directions given them how to avoid falling into the
e again. Now, as it is this last, which gives the finishing Stroak
all the rest, Practice and Imitation being the End of all Instructi-
; it will very naturally follow, that an Imitation carried on after
e Manner I have described, must be the best and most effectual
ans of any for attaining the End proposed, a competent Know-
ge of the *Latin* Tongue. For the very Definition of *Grammar*
ng, that it is *the Art of Speaking and Writing a Language rightly
well*, how can it be said that one has attained that Art, who has
ver exercised himself to any Purpose either in the one or the other?
is a great and, in my Opinion, a fundamental Error in Educati-
, to think that the *Latin Tongue* can be acquired by the bare Rea-
g of Authors, and explaining them, tho' never so accurately, in
r own native Language: For unless to this be added, that which
ne makes the Artificer, *viz.* Use and Exercise, or a constant Pra-
ce of imitating what we read, by speaking or writing in that Lan-
ge our selves, we may indeed acquire a considerable Knowledge
the Things those Authors treat of, but must after all continue
re Novices in what ought to have been our principal Concern, I
an the Language in which they wrote.

§ 5. Having thus made it appear from Fact and Experience, as
ll as from the Reason of the Thing, That the Practice of speaking
d writing *Latin*, directed by a good *System* of Grammatical Rules,
d daily improved by the Example of the Authors one reads, is the
diest and surest Way of attaining that Language, I proceed now
re directly to shew, That a Grammar, whose Rules are concei-
d in *Latin*, is, *cæteris paribus*, better adapted for the Purpose I
ve mentioned, than that which is expressed in our own native
ngue. And this is no less than a plain and genuine Consequence
what is above represented. For, if the constant Practice of speak-
and writing *Latin*, is the most proper and expedite Way for the
aining the Knowledge of that Language, it very naturally follows,
t the more we are thus exercised, we are the more directly carried
ward in that Design; and on the contrary, the more we are di-
ted from it, by the Intervention of any other Language, we are
much interrupted in the Use of *Latin*. And if for good Reasons,
I have shewn) it was thought expedient that in Schools the gene-

ral

ral Converſation ſhould be kept up in *Latin*, with reſpect to ever thing elſe, it could not but appear reaſonable, that in what relates the immediate Means of acquiring the Language, the ſame Metho ſhould as far as was practicable be alſo purſued. I readily agre that the firſt *Rudiments* of the Language ought to be delivered the Learner's own Mother-tongue, becauſe he is not otherwiſe c pable of underſtanding them. But when theſe are ſufficiently ing cated, and he is in a good Meaſure become Maſter of them, I ſ no Reaſon why he may not proceed to the more particular Rules the Language, which we commonly call the *Grammar* of it, in t very Language it ſelf. To make this a little more plain, I lay down for a Principle in Teaching, that a Boy ought not to leave *Rudiments* till he is fully Maſter of the *Declenſions* and *Conjugation* and the fundamental Rules of *Syntax*; and ſo is capable of havi ſome eaſy *Latin* Author, ſuch as the *Dicta Sapientum*, *Corderius* the like, explained unto him. It is obvious, that by a *Latin* Auth here I mean not one of thoſe ancient *Romans*, but a Book or Tr tiſe writ in *Latin*, for the Uſe of Beginners, be the Author of wh Country ſoever. When the Boy then, I ſay, is thus far adva ced, that he can with the uſual Aſſiſtance underſtand any one theſe, I ſee nothing needs hinder him from being taught a Gra mar in *Latin*, there being no more Difficulty in the one than the ther, or if there is, it proceeds from ſome other Cauſe, as I ſh ſhew afterwards, in which the Language, as ſuch, is in nowiſe co cerned. It is evident, that according to this Method, I would ha the *Grammar* to be conſidered as an ordinary *School Author*, a would have it taught and explained much after the ſame Manner one of theſe There is no Abſurdity, I am ſure, in this. For ought always to be remembred, that in this Kind of Education, i not ſo much the Knowledge of Things, as of Words, that is inte ed; and conſequently, it is not material what Subject the Auth treats of, but how fit and proper he is for improving me in t Language. And in this Reſpect, I can ſay with good Aſſuranc that a *Latin* Grammar hath the Advantage above any Author wh ſoever. For, at the ſame time, it not only furniſhes me with a Sto of *Latin* Words and Phraſes, as theſe do, but directly and immedia ly (which they do not) inſtructs me how to uſe and apply them.

§ 6. But here the former Objection againſt this Practice will ſt be urged. *Why ſhould young ones be plagued and confounded wi theſe abſtruſe and difficult* Latin *Rules, when all thoſe Things can more eaſily, and in leſs Time, taught and acquired in a known La guage*? To this I might anſwer in the *firſt* Place by denying t Fact: For I am aſſured by ſome Maſters, of as great Sufficiency a Experience as any in this Kingdom, who had tried both Ways, th

y found as great Difficulty and Loss of Time in the one as the o-
r. And this, tho' it may seem a great Paradox at first, will,
hen duly considered, be found to be supported with very good
ason. For here it is carefully to be observed (which these Obje-
rs have not, all along through this Controversy, sufficiently advert-
to) that this Difficulty or Obscurity, which they complain of in
se *Latin* Rules, lies not in the Language in which they are deli-
ed, but in the Subject there treated of, which will continue much
same, in what Language soever these are conveyed. It is much
same to the Scholar, whether he say *Noun* or *Nomen*, *Substan-*
e or *Substantivum*, *Gender* or *Genus*, *&c.* they are all equally ob-
re or unknown to him, till such Time as they are explained unto
n. And to one that has been taught his *Rudiments* as he ought,
at greater Difficulty can it be to say, *Nomen in* es *est feminini ge-*
is, *Adjectivum concordat cum Substantivo in genere*, *numero &*
u, than, A Noun in es is of the feminine Gender, An Adje-
ve agrees with its Substantive in Gender, Number and
se? If there is any greater Difficulty in the one than the other,
must ly in the pronouncing the *Latin* Words, or being able to
strue them; than which generally nothing is more easy, and in
mparison of which, far greater and unavoidable Difficulties must
ur to him every Day in the Course of his Authors. Nay he will
it almost as uneasy to decline an Adjective and a Substantive to-
her through all their Cases, especially if they are of different De-
sions, as *penna mollis*, *anus formosa*, *serenus* or *serena dies*; and
in varying any Verb in short Sentences throughout its several
ces, Moods, Tenses, Numbers and Persons: as, He teaches
ammar, He shall be taught Grammar, Let him teach
ammar, I wish we had been taught Grammar, They hope
Grammar will be diligently taught, *&c.* which all good Ma-
s are careful to cause their Scholars to do, before they come to
t we call *Grammar*; I say he will find these almost as uneasy as
Thing he will meet with in the first Books of the common *La-*
Systems, (in which the Hardship is supposed greatest,) with re-
t to the Language, which is the only Thing I am here concern-
n. I except from this the *Verse-Rules*, in which, I own indeed,
e is more Difficulty: But as the Sense of them is repeated in
se, the Difficulty is much abated; and if the Master is at the
Pains in them, as he is or ought to be in other Things, they
in a short time become plain and easy, as is confirmed by daily
rience. But here it is to be considered, that these same Verse-
s, however difficult at first, prove in the End a great Ease to the
s Memory, in which if they are once duly imprinted, the Mea-
to which they are confin'd will make them stick faster there, than

a

a vaſt Number of Repetitions of the Proſe ones will do: Which ven Mr. *Clarke* himſelf is ſenſible of, who has, tho' otherwiſe Friend to Poetry, as appears by his Eſſay upon Study, ſet down Exceptions from his Rules of Genders in Doggrel Engliſh Rhime, ſuppoſing that otherwiſe the Memory would not ſo well re them.

§ 7. But *Secondly*, let this Difficulty, of having the *Latin* Ton taught by a *Latin* Grammar, be ſuch as theſe Men repreſent it, that the Teaching it in our native Tongue is much more e I anſwer, that the many Advantages to be had from the former, more than compenſate that Loſs. For 1*ſt*, a great deal of the P ctice of ſpeaking *Latin*, which I have ſhewed above to be of ſo gr Uſe, is hereby cultivated and kept up; whereas by the other M thod, it is ſo far interrupted or diſcarded. 2*dly*, There is a cert *Gravity* and *Solemnity*, (if I may ſo ſpeak) in the *Latin*, which is to make the Boy ſerious in what he is about: But when the Th is told him in his vulgar Tongue, with which he is ſo familiarly quainted, it will not have the like Effect. This with ſome may for a Mock-obſervation: But when it is conſidered, that young being generally of a light, jocular and trifling Temper, and their Minds are eaſily carried off to any Thing that will give Sc to that Diſpoſition; it is not to be wondred, if they ſport the ſelves ſometimes with Rules delivered in a Language ſo familiar them, and which thereby furniſhes them with Matter for their ch iſh Merriment: Whereas their being taught them in *Latin*, a Ton they are as yet but little acquainted with, and from which their latile Fancies cannot draw ſuch Occaſion for Dalliance, will much ſtrain theſe ludicrous Amuſements, and confine them to the Buſi they have in Hand. Thus a Boy, when he is repeating that R of Mr. *Hunter*'s Grammar:

The Names of Men are Maſculine,
And Women's Names are Feminine:
When Names to either Sex agree,
Then let their Gender common be.

Or this:

As *in the firſt ſtill* hæc *receives*;
But in the third hæc *always craves*;
Vas, vaſis *tho', is neuter*; *ſo*
As antis *to be* hic *ſtill know.*
As aſſis *ſhall the maſculine gain,*
And all belonging to its Train.

Or that of Mr. *Clarke*, who, after he has told that Words in *AS* are feminine, gives these Exceptions:

> *But the Word* as *for Male still passes,*
> *For Neuters* nefas, fas, vas vasis,
> As, antis *making, is Male too, as*
> Adamas, gigas, elephas.

will be ready to fancy he is repeating a Piece of a common Ballad, which he has heard young Girls sing at their Spinning Wheels, and probably will make as merry with the one, as they do with the other. But if *Latin* Rules are prescrib'd him, they will put a due Restraint upon his Levity, and call in his Thoughts to the Thing they were design'd for. And this naturally leads me to another Consideration; which is, *3dly*, That the Difficulty so much complain'd of in those *Latin* Grammars (as all other Difficulties) is, when rightly managed by a judicious Master, a Spur to Industry; and, when overcome, gives a particular Satisfaction and Pleasure to the Learner; and the very Pains it costs him, renders the Acquest the more valuable. But it will readily be otherwise with your *English-Latin* Grammars, especially your Rime ones: for he cannot think much of committing to Memory, that which to him looks so like a Ballad; and if he should sometimes blunder in it, he will be apt to reckon it very incongruous, that at the Pleasure of a peevish Master, he should be obliged to sing that to a melancholy Tune, which by the very Make of it seem'd only fitted for a merry one. *4thly*, This Difficulty, that is alledged to attend a *Latin* Grammar, more than that which is written in our native Tongue, is, for that very Reason, more apt to make a deep and lasting Impression on the Mind. For things that are easily acquired, are as easily forgotten; whereas, things that cannot be fix'd in the Memory but with some Difficulty and Labour, must therefore be lodged the deeper in it, and consequently be the less liable to be rooted out or defaced. And this removes, in a good Measure, the Argument drawn by the Adversaries of this Kind of Grammar, from the greater Space of Time required for learning it than the other. For supposing both equally full and comprehensive, yet as the one will require more frequent, and almost continual Repetitions, to make the Impression that is necessary upon the Memory; when twice or thrice going over the other, will, for the Reason I have mentioned, serve the Purpose; it will be found in the Issue, that the Odds of Time between them shall be very inconsiderable. I might here add, *5thly*, That the Terms of Art, which are used in Grammar, and make up a great Part of it, being generally of a *Latin* Extract, the Boy,

who is taught them in that Language, will the ſooner underſtand the Meaning of them, as he is thereby enabled to know whence they have their Original; to which his own Language can give him no Manner of Aſſiſtance. And here I cannot but take notice of it as a Thing very unſuitable, that a Boy, who is daily to be employ'd in *Latin*, and is to make it his Buſineſs to learn the Names of every thing (as far as he is capable) in that Language, and to obſerve their ſeveral Etymologies and Derivations; yet, if he is taught in the Manner preſcrib'd by Mr. *Clarke* and others, he muſt remain altogether ignorant of the *Latin* Names of thoſe Things in which he is moſt converſant, not to mention the Reaſons for which they were originally impoſed upon them. For if every thing about them, and all Queſtions and Anſwers relating to them, are to be performed in his own Tongue only; both the one and the other muſt, for that very Cauſe, be to him abſolutely unknown.

§ 8. I have now inſiſted at ſome Length, upon the ſecond Part of the Task I had preſcribed to my ſelf, which was to vindicate the common Practice of teaching the *Latin* Tongue by a Grammar compoſed in the ſame Language, from the Objections that are raiſed againſt it upon that Head: And, as I flatter my ſelf to have done it to the Satisfaction of all unbiaſſed and competent Judges; ſo, I think, I have ſome Grounds to believe, that, not to mention others, had the famous Mr. *Locke* duly conſidered and weigh'd all Things, as I have above repreſented them, (as that great Man was otherwiſe very capable to have done) he would either have changed his Opinion, or been leſs poſitive in what he aſſerts. But I have no Reaſon to expect this from Mr. *Clarke*, who is ſo full of his conceited Skill in theſe Matters, as fondly to imagine that all Men in the World were Fools in this Particular, till he came into it. What elſe could move him, in the Preface to his late Grammar, *p.* 4. to affirm in ſuch a confident Manner, "That the Abſurdity of Teaching the *Latin* "Tongue by a Grammar in *Latin*, is ſo very groſs, that one would "wonder how it ſhould ever enter into the Head of any Perſon of "common Senſe, much more, how it ſhould ever become a natio- "nal Practice." And *p.* 5. "That the moſt rude and barbarous "Nation upon Earth cannot furniſh us with any Inſtance of a "Cuſtom, that carries more of Stupidity in the Front of it? There- "fore (*adds he*) it is ſomewhat ſtrange, that a Practice ſo miſchie- "vous, as well as ridiculous, ſhould not long ſince have had a Stop "put to it by Law." And a little below, he again calls it *a ſenſe- leſs and barbarous Cuſtom*: And in his *Eſſay upon Education*, *p.* 19. he ſays. "That it is ſuch a palpable Piece of Abſurdity, that he is "perfectly at a Loſs to imagine what can be alledged in Vindication "of it." I would not willingly ſay a harſh Thing of any Man, par-

ticularly

cularly of Mr. *Clarke*, ſome of whoſe other Labours are very uſeful in their Kind: But I cannot diſſemble, that it provoked my Indignation to no ſmall Degree, to ſee one, whoſe Learning, if it is ſolid, ſhould have taught him more Modeſty, thus to banter, not the low and the ignorant, but the moſt learned and polite Part of Mankind, and to expoſe them as the arranteſt Fools that ever appeared in the World. Had that *Cuſtom* been ſo *ſtupid* and *ridiculous* as he repreſents it, he might have been aſſured, that it either had never been received into, or long ſince baniſhed from the Schools; as on the other Hand, when he knew that the pureſt and moſt elegant *Latin* Writers that ever flouriſhed upon Earth, ſince that Language left off to be national, were educated after the Manner he ſo much decries; common Reaſon ſhould have obliged him to think, that a Method that produced ſuch excellent Effects, could not poſſibly be ſo *abſurd* as his Fancy might ſuggeſt. It is, as I ſaid before, an inconteſtable Maxim, that where ſeveral Means are propoſed for obtaining a certain End, theſe which moſt effectually conduce to that End, muſt for that very Reaſon be preferable to all others. Now this is the Caſe here; for it is an undeniable Matter of Fact, that the Habit of Speaking and Writing *Latin*, was never brought to ſuch Perfection, as when that Language was taught in the Manner I contend for: It muſt therefore follow with the cleareſt Evidence, that all other Methods that do not equally anſwer and come up to this End, ought upon that very Account to give Place unto it. This alone, without any other Reaſoning, is more than ſufficient to confute all that Mr. *Clarke* has, or can ſay upon this Head. But we needed not have carried this Argument ſo high; for it will be enough to ſhew the Vanity as well as Falſity of Mr. *Clarke*'s Poſitions, if it ſhall be found, (which I hope he will not have the Confidence to deny) that as good Scholars have been, and daily are made by the common Method, as the other he practiſes and ſo ſtrenuouſly ſets up for. Nay, ſuppoſe we ſhould yet fall a Peg or two lower, and be forced to own, that his Method is really better than the common one; if the Thing can but be tolerably effected by this laſt, it is, I think, with all modeſt Men, ſufficient to ſave it from being branded with the moſt ignominious Character of *ſtupid* and *abſurd*, than which a viler Epithet can hardly be given it. But, as I think, I have abundantly evinced, both by Experience and the Reaſon of the Thing, that the commonly received Cuſtom is in ſeveral Reſpects, not only equal, but ſuperior to his Scheme; I am hopeful that the wiſer Sort of Maſters will not be much moved with the Railing, with which, inſtead of Reaſoning, he would fright them from it.

§ 9. It is of a Piece with this Management of his, that he compares the Teaching of a Language by Rules writ in the very Lan-

guage to be learn'd, to the uſing of Prayers in an *unknown Tongue*. There is no Compariſon between theſe two Practices. For who ever dream'd, that the Learner was ſtill to continue ignorant of the particular Meaning of every Rule he is taught, as theſe that uſe ſuch Prayers are ſuppoſed to do? It is ſo far otherwiſe, that in all well ordered Schools, where ſuch *Latin* Grammars are taught, every thing in them, ſo far as is neceſſary, is explained in the Learner's Mother-tongue, till the Senſe of every Word of them is made clear to his Underſtanding; and then, and not till then, is he obliged to commit them to Memory, and apply them to the Uſes for which they were deſigned. The Reaſons for ſo doing I have given above. And if this ſeems ſo hard and difficult a Thing for a Boy, as Mr. *Clarke* would make the World believe, it will henceforth be proper, that he ſhould have all his Authors likewiſe taught him in *Engliſh*. For there is almoſt the ſame Reaſon for both, and the Difficulty in the latter greater than in the former. When the Boy firſt ſets about *Eutropius*, *Nepos*, *Terence*, or any *Latin* Author, he treads upon unknown Ground, and has fully as much Need of a Guide to direct him, as in his *Grammar*: And if the explaining, conſtruing, and fixing the Words and Phraſes of the one in his Memory, is a difficult Task, the other is yet more ſo; and if for that Reaſon the former is to be laid aſide, ſo alſo ought the latter. It may therefore on theſe Grounds be expected, that Mr. *Clarke*, as in the *Diſſertation* ſubjoined to his *Grammar* he ſeems to put but a ſmall Value upon the *Latin* Tongue; ſo among his other Improvements on this Subject, he will at laſt adviſe the laying the *Latin* Authors quite aſide, and that the riſing Generation ſhould content themſelves with the *Tranſlations* he already has, or ſhall afterwards give us of them. This is little leſs than a natural *Corollary* from the Doctrine he advances, and is no more abſurd than the Reaſon he there founds upon. For if a *Latin* Grammar does ſo much *perplex* and *confound* young Children, as he tells us it does, and for that Cauſe ought to be baniſhed from Schools; it muſt follow, that whatever equally or more perplexes them, (as I am ſure theſe ſame crabbed Authors do, let them be taught what Way he pleaſes) ought to be treated after the ſame Manner. He may indeed by ſuch a Project, gain the Thanks and Applauſe of thoſe poor young ones, whoſe Eaſe and Convenience he has ſo much at Heart; but I very much doubt that the more judicious and learned Part of Mankind, will not ſo eaſily go into his Sentiments. The whole Matter comes in ſhort to this plain Iſſue, If the *Latin* Tongue is to be cultivated and kept up in the World, and if that cannot be done to Purpoſe, but by great Labour and a conſtant Exerciſe in the Language: If this Exerciſe is beſt promoted by a *Latin* Grammar; and if long Experience has

s confirmed the Uſefulneſs of that Method, as I think I have pret- clearly made out; then it cannot, I hope, long remain a Queſti-, which of the two Ways, either the old and common one, of hich we have ſeen ſo good Effects, or the new one deviſed by Mr. *larke* and others, of which no ſuch Inſtances can be given, ought be taken as the better Method for acquiring the *Latin* Tongue.

§ 10. He talks indeed of having an *Act* of *Parliament* made againſt e old Cuſtom, and thinks it ſtrange that it has not been done long o. This, I own, would do his Buſineſs effectually, for there is reſiſting ſo powerful an Authority: But, how fond ſoever he can of his Opinion in that Matter, he may be well aſſured, that that guſt Aſſembly, which gives Laws to the Nation, will not take his re Word upon it, but will, if they ſhall think fit to take ſuch an ffair under their Conſideration, proceed in it in a Manner worthy them, *i. e.* with that exquiſite Prudence and Judgment, which ſcovers its ſelf in all their other Determinations. And when that all be, we need be under no great Apprehenſion that ſuch a Sta- te will ever be made. But he takes, in my Opinion, too much reedom with the *Legiſlative* Power, who would have it ſo idly d unneceſſarily employed. For if it is true, as he tells us, *p. 6. That e Thing is utterly unattainable* by the common Method; and that Youth can no more learn by the Help of a Language they do not underſtand, than the People can pray to God in a Language they do not underſtand, which every Body ſees to be impoſſible, and Nonſenſe to pretend: " If, I ſay, this is true, then he might, with e ſame Reaſon, wiſh or expect, that *Acts* of *Parliament* ſhould be ade, ſtatuting and ordaining, that, for hereafter, no Man ſhall eak with his Hands, or write with his Tongue, and that People ould not make Ploughs of Straw, or Boots of Cob-webs, and in- merable ſuch like. For if every Body ſees that *it is impoſſible and onſenſe to pretend*, that *Latin* can be taught by a *Latin* Grammar, ey will no more need an *Act* of *Parliament* to diſcharge that Pra- ice, than they will need to be diſcharged the other Things I have med: The ſame common Senſe that teaches them *without a Law* forbear the one, being ſufficient to direct them *without a Law* to rbear the other. But, to be ſerious in the Matter, when I read eſe Words of Mr. *Clarke*, and, to the ſame Purpoſe, in the *Title-* ge of Dr. *Shaw*'s *Latin* Syntax, publiſhed *anno* 1727. where, af- telling us that his Rules are compoſed in the Childrens own Lan- age, he adds in a Parentheſis, (*It being impoſſible for them to learn in any other*) I was, and ſtill am at a Loſs to underſtand what ey mean. For it is not to be imagined that Perſons of their Lear- ng and Experience can be ignorant, that, for ſome Centuries, the tin Tongue was only taught by ſuch a Grammar over all *Europe*, and

and in moſt Places of it ſtill continues to be ſo taught to this Day. How then can they call that *impracticable*, which has been, and yet is ſo univerſally *practiſed*? The only poſſible Senſe therefore that can put upon theſe Expreſſions, is, That Boys cannot be taught *Latin* Grammar by Rules conceived in *Latin*, unleſs theſe Rules are firſt explained to them in their own Language. Who ever doubted it, or pretended to do it otherwiſe? Nothing, certainly, can be a Rule that is not underſtood; and no Language unknown can poſſibly be underſtood, till it is firſt tranſlated into a Language that is known. Theſe Things are ſo ſelf-evident, that no Body needs to be told them. But if Mr. *Clarke*'s Meaning is, that theſe *Latin* Rules are never explained to Boys in their own native Tongue, which by comparing them to theſe *Popiſh Prayers*, neceſſarily requires it ſhould be, there is nothing more falſe. For, whatever may be done elſewhere, I am ſure that in *Scotland* there was never a Maſter guilty of a Practice, which (to uſe his Words) is ſo manifeſtly *ſenſeleſs* and *ridiculous*. But Mr. *Clarke*, forgetting the Compariſon which he had made a little before, and is ſo fond of as to repeat it again in the ſame Paragraph, owns *that it is wiſely done, that in their Schools they are provided with a conſtruing Book to* Lily, (*i. e.* the *Latin* Grammar that is taught in *England.*) Why now, had theſe poor *Papiſts* ſuch a conſtruing Book provided them for explaining their publick Prayers, and were the ſame Pains taken in theſe as in a *Latin* Grammar, it would indeed compleat Mr. *Clarke*'s Parallel; but be it ſo, or otherwiſe, it quite deſtroys his Argument. For if the Meaning of the Words pronounced in theſe *Prayers* continue, as is ſuppoſed, always unknown, whatever Abſurdity there may be in the Matter, there can be no Inference drawn from thence in a Caſe where every Thing is ſuppoſed to be made plain and intelligible before it is required that any Uſe ſhould be made of it. But, on the other Hand, if People can be brought to underſtand theſe ſame *Prayers* in a Language that was formerly unknown to them, (as is done with *Lily*, and other ſuch Grammars) where is the *Abſurdity*, *Miſchief* and *Nonſenſe*, which he ſo much talks of, that would ariſe from the Uſe of ſuch *Prayers*? Such a Practice, I am ſure, is ſo far from being forbid by *Law*, (as Mr. *Clarke* would have done in the other Caſe) that we have a plain *Act* of *Parliament*, 14 *Caroli* II. *cap.* 4. authorizing it, by allowing the publick Worſhip to be performed in *Latin*, not only in the two *Univerſities*, and in the *Convocations* of the Clergy of both Provinces, but alſo in the Schools of *Weſtminſter*, *Wincheſter* and *Eaton*. And we may very juſtly infer that a *Parliament*, which allowed the one, would never, where the Reaſon is yet ſtronger, condemn the other.

§ 11. But Mr. *Clarke* hath yet, *p.* 4. one Argument in Reſerve

hich he thinks ſufficient for exploding ſuch Grammars, *viz.* That
t is by Hool's *Engliſh Expoſition that Boys learn their Grammar-*
les, Lily's *Language is utterly uſeleſs, and ſtands for nothing* ——.
t I never almoſt heard any Thing more weak than this Pretence.
e if this Reaſoning is good, it will equally follow, that if it is by
Engliſh Tranſlations that Boys come to underſtand *Corderius*, *Ne-*
Florus, &c. as certainly that was his Deſign, the *Latin* Language
theſe Authors is alſo utterly *uſeleſs*, and *ſtands for nothing*. And if
t is the Caſe, then I ſee no Reaſon, why, as I ſaid before, the origi-
Language of thoſe Authors, which is ſo *uſeleſs* and *inſignificant*,
uld not be altogether dropt, and that the bare Tranſlations of
m may not wholly do the Buſineſs. I confeſs, that if Boys were,
ſo many Parrots, to conſider nothing in their *Latin* Rules but
e Sound and Noiſe, and were only to heed the *Engliſh* Explica-
n of them, it were much better to lay them quite aſide, and hold
mſelves by *Engliſh* Rules only. But who ever taught or explain-
theſe *Latin* Rules at this Rate? No Body, I am ſure, ſince *Eng-*
d was a Kingdom, and *Latin* was thought worthy to be learnt
it. On the contrary, I always took it for certain, that theſe *La-*
Rules were not only to be explained as to the general Meaning
hem, but ſo to be explained, as that the Boy ſhould fully under-
nd the particular Signification and Conſtruction of every Word of
m, and thereby know diſtinctly what he is ſaying when he is re-
ing them in that Language. This is obvious from what Mr.
rke himſelf takes Notice of, *viz. That their Schools are wiſely*
ided with a conſtruing Book to Lily; for that Book does not give
general Explanation of *Lily*'s Rules, but, in a moſt minute and
icular Manner, ranges and conſtrues, in their natural Order, e-
y Word of them. And if this is to render *Lily*'s *Latin* uſeleſs,
now not what will render it, or indeed any Thing writ in *Latin*
ul. For I know no Method more effectual for rendring *Latin*,
ny other Language that is not a native one, eaſy aud familiar to
Underſtanding, than this,

12. But all this, tho' ſelf-evident, will not convince Mr. *Clarke*,
, in his *Eſſay upon Educ.* p. 21. has theſe Words. "They,
Boys] *ſays he*, underſtand not the *Latin*; but you'll ſay by the
lelp of their conſtruing Book they may. No, I ſay, they can
ot; they comprehend that Jumble of *Latin* and *Engliſh* Words
n their conſtruing Book, no better than the *Latin* by itſelf. This
ny one, that teaches *Lily*'s Grammar, may quickly be ſatisfied of
y his own Experience. Nothing will make them underſtand
hat the *Latin* Rule is to teach them, but the frequent inculcat-
ng it in plain *Engliſh*, joyn'd with a great deal of Practice."
s is the ſtrangeſt Thing in the World. For if Boys (after they
have

have been taught their *Declenſions* and *Conjugations* to Purpoſe, to
gether with ſome of the chief Rules of *Syntax*, in their own La
guage, which is almoſt every where, and particularly in *England*
done) cannot by their conſtruing Book, and the Aſſiſtance of
diligent Maſter, be brought to underſtand the true and exact Mea
ing of a *Latin* Rule, not only in *Engliſh*, but in the *Latin* by itſel
and without the *Engliſh*, it is abſolutely impoſſible that ever the
ſhould be brought to underſtand any Thing in that Language at a
there being no other Way that can be thought on, for rendring
Language that is not their own intelligible to them, ſo fit and pro
per as this. But, becauſe Mr. *Clarke* ſays, that *Experience will quick
ly ſatisfy us of the contrary*, let us bring the Matter to a fair Tri
Suppoſing then, that a Boy (after he has been taught the Things
have named, and with that Accuracy which Mr. *Clarke* himſelf re
quires) is carried forward to *Lily*'s Grammar; the firſt Rule he
meets with there is, *Propria quæ maribus tribuuntur maſcula dicu
&c.* At the firſt opening of the Book, I ſhall eaſily grant, that he
can do nothing but pronounce the *Latin* Words of that Rule, an
that he is ſo far from underſtanding the Meaning of it, that he does
not as yet perhaps know the Signification of one Vocable in it: And
were he to be left to himſelf in that State, *Lily*'s *Latin* Rule would
be indeed, as Mr. *Clarke* elſewhere expreſſes it, to him *utterly u
leſs, and ſtand for nothing* but bare Sound. But will not the Help
of a right Maſter, either with, or without a conſtruing Book, join
ed with what he had been taught formerly, in the leaſt mend the
Matter? No, ſays Mr. *Clarke*, Lily's *Language muſt*, for all that,
ſtill remain *uſeleſs and good for nothing*. What, will it do him no
Service for underſtanding the *Latin* of that Rule, to inform him, firſt
not only of the general Signification of each Word in it, but alſo
the particular Signification of them according to the common Law
of Declenſion and Conjugation, *i. e.* that not only *mas*, for Exam
ple, the Nominative Singular or Root of the Noun *maribus*, ſignifies
a Male, but that the Word *maribus* itſelf, being the Dative plural
of that Noun, ſignifies to Males? In like Manner, that not only
tribuo, which is the Root of the Verb *tribuuntur*, ſignifies to give,
aſſign or attribute, but that the Word *tribuuntur* itſelf, which is
the third Perſon plural of the preſent Tenſe of the Indicative of
that Verb, ſignifies they (or whatever Things are ſpoke of) are
given, aſſign'd or attributed; and ſo of the reſt? This being
done, will it not make the *Latin* plain unto him, to have all the
Words in the Rule placed in their natural Order, and if any Words
are underſtood, to have them ſupplied and filled up unto him thus,
O puer, tu dicas nomina propria, quæ tribuuntur maribus, maſculi
i. e. *muſculini generis*; and then that the Whole be reſumed in ſum

ler Parcels in *Latin* and *English*, thus: *O puer*, O Boy; *tu dicas*, call thou, or thou mayst call, *nomina propria*, proper Nouns, or Nouns proper, *quæ*, which, *tribuuntur maribus*, are given or attributed to Males, *mascula*, masculine, or of the Masculine Gender. If this Method of teaching the *Latin* Rules of Grammar (which ought, so far as the Boy's Ignorance or small Progress makes it necessary, to be constantly followed) will not bring him to the formal Knowledge of the *Latin* Rules themselves, I know nothing that will bring him to the Knowledge of any Thing writ in *Latin*. I own, that the Thing at first will give him no small Uneasiness; and that particularly it will not a little both surprize and perplex him, to find the Words in these *Latin* Rules ranged in a quite different Order, from what they are placed in in his own Language: But when it is told him, that the Constitution of the *Latin* Tongue allows, and the Beauty of it generally requires such an Order, he will, by the encouraging Condescensions of a gentle and prudent Master, be in a short Time reconcil'd to that Order, till at last it become easy and familiar to him. But whatever is in his *Grammar*, he will find, as I said, the same Difficulty in all the *Latin* Books he must read; and whatever conquers one will conquer both, and what is insuperable to the one, must likewise be so to the other. It is therefore doubly absurd in Mr. *Clarke* to maintain, that it is impossible to make Boys understand *Lily's Latin* Rules (and the same may be said of any other Grammar writ in that Language) in themselves, and without *English*: *First*, That it is false, and contrary to Fact and daily Experience: And *Secondly*, That if it were true, it would be equally impossible for them ever to understand any *Latin* Author at all.

§ 13. I have only a few Words to add in answer to the common Objection against *Latin* Grammars, taken from the contrary Method of learning all other Languages. This Objection, for as common as it is, Mr. *Clarke*, tho' otherwise a great Enemy to every Thing that is common, thinks fit to make use of. For *Essay upon Education*, *p.* 19. "I appeal, *says he*, to any Man of common Sense, whether if he was to learn the *Hebrew* Tongue, he would for that Purpose make use of a Grammar writ in *Hebrew*." And after a great deal of Banter against such a Practice in the Learning of *Latin*, he brings a Quotation from *Pere Malebranche*, to back what he has said. But all this gives me no Manner of Disturbance, or affects in the least the ordinary Method of teaching that Language. For I readily reply, that the *Latin Tongue* was always, as I have shew'd above, reckon'd to stand on a different Footing from that of other Languages, especially the modern ones. It was design'd to be the common Language of learned Men in all the civiliz'd

Parts of the World; and for that very Reaſon, it was judged proper that it ſhould be taught and acquired in a Manner quite different from that of other Languages. As in theſe no more was generally intended, but that the Learner ſhould be capable to underſtand a Book, Diſcourſe, Letter, or the like, writ in them, and that a ſmall Time, comparatively ſpeaking, was ſufficient for that Purpoſe: So they made Choice of a Method, the propereſt indeed of any for all that they deſign'd, of having the Rules of theſe Languages delivered to them in their own Mother-tongue. But the firſt Reſtorers and Promoters of the *Latin* Tongue, had a quite different Notion concerning it. For it being propoſed that the Learners of it ſhould not only be able to underſtand the Books, *&c.* that are writ in it, but alſo to ſpeak and write it themſelves; they wiſely pitch'd on a Method of acquiring it, which ſeem'd beſt calculated for that End; and that was by having its Rules (as ſoon as the Thing was practicable) delivered in the very Language it ſelf. People that have not duly conſidered the Reaſons they had for ſuch a Conduct, may mock and ridicule it as much as they pleaſe. But it will remain nevertheleſs a fix'd and unchangeable Truth, that, as all Languages, whether living or dead, are beſt, *i. e.* moſt accurately and fully, acquired by Practice and Imitation; ſo particularly the *Latin* Tongue, to ſuch at leaſt as deſign to ſpeak or write it themſelves to any Purpoſe, is more fully and perfectly, *ceteris paribus*, attain'd, the more they are employed in this Practice and Imitation; and the more they are diverted from it, by converſing in any other Language, the ſmaller and ſlower muſt their Improvements in it be. But having ſo fully cleared up this Matter above, *p.* 34. *& ſeqq.* there is no need I ſhould inſiſt further upon it here. I ſhall therefore only add that in all I have ſaid upon this Head, I always ſuppoſe that the Learner has it in his View to acquire the Faculty of Speaking or Writing tolerably in that Language. But when the happy Days ſhall come, that the *Latin* Tongue ſhall be laid aſide from being *the common Language of the learned*, and that neither Boys nor Men ſhall any longer *be teas'd and plagued with Speaking or Writing it*, as Mr *Clarke*, *Diſſert. up. Lang. p.* 181, wiſhes and adviſes, he ſhall have free Liberty for me, to teach that little that is then to be learn'd of it what Way he pleaſes. But then, as he would have ſome modern Language, and particularly the *French*, ſubſtituted in its Room, I do not ſee any great Abſurdity that would follow, tho' Boys at School (where that Language, in ſuch an Event, would become their principal Study, and they neceſſarily be obliged both to ſpeak and write it) ſhould, after the Foundations are firſt laid by the Help of their own, be taught the reſt of it by Rules writ in the *French* Language.

SECT

SECT. III.

Some Critical Remarks on Mr. Clarke's *new* Latin *Grammar.*

§ 1. I Have now gone through all that Mass of Obloquy and Reproach, (for I have shew'd, I think, that it deserves not the Name of true Reasoning) with which Mr. *Clarke* has in a very plentiful Manner loaded the commonly received Practice of Teaching *Latin* by a Grammar writ in the same Language. But there was somewhat more, I'm afraid, at the Bottom. Mr. *Clarke* it seems was resolved to compose a new *Grammar*, and, as is usual with too many Authors, to pave the Way for its better Reception in the World, he thought fit to decry the Performances of others that had treated that Subject before him, especially such as were of a more established Character and Reputation. Now, as *Latin* Grammar has been generally taught, not in *England* only, but in most Places of *Europe*, in the Manner so often mentioned, and that his was to be done after a different Method, he judged that nothing could more contribute to the promoting of his, than the removing of the other Method, *quo jure quave injuria*, out of the Way. I will not positively affirm it, but I cannot dissemble, that I shrewdly suspect, that this is Mr. *Clarke*'s secret Design, in that long and furious Declamation he has made against the common Practice. But whatever his Purpose was, and what Effect soever his Discourse may have for laying aside the old Method of teaching *Latin*, which I hope shall be little; yet I perswade my self, that his Performance shall not meet with much Encouragement, upon another Account. For whether *Latin* is to be taught by an *English* or *Latin* Grammar; yet it cannot enter into my Mind to think, that that great and wise People to which he belongs, will much entertain, far less establish for a national Grammar, as he would insinuate, that one of his; which can be demonstrated to be so many Ways faulty, defective and irregular. And that this is not said without Reason, I have thought fit, both for the Sake of Truth, and also that Mr. *Clarke* may remit a little of his Severity against others, to shew that he likewise hath his own Infirmities, and these perhaps as great as any of those Grammarians and others he finds so much Fault with: For the doing whereof, I have added a new Section of *some Critical Remarks* upon this his last Performance.

§ 2. And here, that I may not *actum agere*, I pass over his many Inconsistencies, as to what is more or less material in Grammar, which I have taken Notice of above, *p.* 7. *& seqq.* As also his

Omiſſions of a great many Things which ought to have place in it, as I have ſhew'd *p.* 22, *&c.*

The firſt Thing therefore I ſhall mention is our Author's baniſhing the *Vocative* from the Number of Caſes. This is one of the moſt glaring Inſtances that ever was given in the World of an affected Novelty. And, as it is againſt all Reaſon, ſo it is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of all Grammarians ancient and modern. One of the moſt ancient, as well as moſt learned among them, *Ter. Varro*, tho' he ſometimes leaves out the *Ablative*, probably becauſe the *Greeks* have none, yet is poſitive for the *Vocative*. For *Lib.* vii. § 6. ſpeaking of the Caſes, he ſays, *Sine controverſia ſunt hi quinque, Quis vocetur, ut* Hercules; *Quemadmodum vocetur, ut* Hercules; *Quò vocetur, ut* ad Herculem; *Cui vocetur, ut* Herculi; *Cujus vocetur, ut* Herculis. Where it is evident, that, by *quemadmodum vocetur*, he means the *Vocative Caſe*, which he elſewhere, as *lib.* viii. § 31 *&* 32, as alſo *A. Gellius*, in ſeveral Places, call *vocandi caſus*. *Quintilian* alſo, *lib.* i. *cap* 4. names the *caſus ſextus*, and, *cap.* 5. he tells us the *Latins* have *ſex* Caſes, of which *five* are common to them with the *Greeks:* And of theſe it was never doubted, but the *Vocative* made one, and had a Termination of its own in moſt Declenſions. But why ſhould we bring Authority to one who ſeems to be placed above it? Let us therefore conſider his Reaſon for omitting this Caſe. And of that he has given us a Hint in his *Eſſay upon Education*, p. 83. but more fully here in his Grammar, *p.* 2. where having ſaid in his Text, "The Caſes of Nouns be five, the Nomi"native, the Accuſative, the Genitive, the Dative and the Ablative;" He ſubjoyns this Note: "I reckon, *ſays he*, only five Caſes, be"cauſe the Vocative is in all *Latin* Nouns the ſame with the No"minative, except in the ſecond Declenſion. Beſides, the Vocative "being uſed only in calling or ſpeaking to, can only belong to "Nouns ſignifying Perſons; for none talk to Brutes or inanimate "Creatures but mad Men, or Poets ſometimes; and therefore it is "abſurd to reckon that a diſtinct Caſe, and clog the Declenſion of "Nouns with it." This is one of the fineſt Reaſons in the World: But let us view it more particularly.

§ 3. And, 1*ſt*, Pray, what was it that gave Riſe to the Diſtinction of Caſes in the *Latin* Tongue, but the different Terminations that were obſerved in the Declenſion of Nouns? And ſince there are found a vaſt Number of Nouns uſed in that Tongue, which have a different Termination, when *called* or *ſpoken* to, from what they have when *named* or *ſpoken of*. Does not common Senſe, and the very Nature of the Thing, neceſſarily require that, to diſtinguiſh the one from the other, they ſhould be accounted different Caſes? If it is ſaid, that very often their Terminations are the ſame, that

equally true of innumerable Words with Reſpect to other Caſes, for Inſtance, all Neuters agree in the Termination (not to mention the Vocative) of their Nominatives and Accuſatives in both Numbers; and all Words of any Gender agree in the Termination of the Datives and Ablatives plural of all Declenſions. In like Manner the Genitive and Dative of the firſt, the Dative and Ablative of the ſecond, and ſometimes of the third, ſingular; and the Nominative and Accuſative (not to ſpeak here of the Vocative) of the third, fourth and fifth, plural, are of the ſame Termination. Muſt therefore ſuch Nouns as theſe be deprived of ſuch Caſes as agree in their Termination with other Caſes? Or muſt Words indeclinable, ſuch as *gelu*, *gummi*, *quatuor*, *tot*, &c. be reckoned to have but one Caſe, becauſe their Termination is always the ſame? No, ſurely, the firſt Grammarians, in determining the Number of the Caſes, had no Regard to what had thus, by Chance, happened to ſome particular Nouns, or to ſome one or more Declenſions of them, which depends intirely upon the arbitrary Cuſtom of the Language. They acted much more wiſely and judiciouſly: For, obſerving that there were a great many Nouns, which, in a certain Manner of applying them in Diſcourſe, had a Termination different from that they had, when otherwiſe applied; they thought that a ſufficient Foundation for a new Caſe, without Reſpect to what Declenſion they happened to be of, or to any other Nouns, where there was no ſuch Change to be found, upon the Account of the different Manner of applying them above mentioned. In this, as in all other Things of the like Kind, they laid down one general and uniform Plan. For as they eſtabliſhed five Declenſions, tho' every Caſe in each of them has not a different Termination, and Nouns indeclinable may be ſaid to be of no Declenſion at all; and they ſtitched upon two Numbers, tho' a great many Nouns are defective either in the one or the other; and the like may be ſaid of the Accidents of Verbs: So they reckoned up ſix Caſes, tho' a ſmaller Number might have ſerved the greater Part of them.

§ 4. But, *2dly*, Whereas he would inſinuate, that Nouns which have a different Termination, when uſed in *ſpeaking to*, from what they have when *ſpoken of*, are really few in Number; the Matter is very far otherwiſe. He adds indeed, of *Latin* Nouns, as if *Greek* Nouns were not worth noticing, tho' the beſt Claſſick Authors, eſpecially the Poets, are full of them, and that in all the three Declenſions to which they belong. But ſuppoſe we ſhould drop them, for which I ſee no Manner of Reaſon, What thinks he of that great Number of *Latin* Subſtantive Nouns in US of the ſecond Declenſion, and of that yet vaſtly greater Number of Adjectives there, whoſe Maſculine is of the ſame Termination, and may be joyned to

maſculine

maſculine Subſtantives of that or any other Declenſion? Are these to be overlookt, as Things of very ſmall Importance in the Language?

§ 5. But, *3dly*, Whereas he may ſay, that few of theſe ſignify or belong to *Perſons*, for whoſe Uſe the Vocative, according to him, was only intended. I anſwer, that neither of theſe is true. For *1ſt*, The Number of theſe that belong to Perſons is very great, moſt of the old *Roman* Names being of that Termination, not to mention that the Generality of the modern proper Names, when uſed in *Latin*, as *Adamus*, *Abrahamus*, *Jacobus*, *Joſephus*, *Ludovicus*, *Fredericus*; and *Buchananus*, *Farnabius*, *Grotius*, *Grevius*, *Muretus*, *Bembus*, *Alvarus*, &c. are of that *Ending*, and, by Conſequence, have a different Termination, when ſpoken to. *2dly*, How little is it true, that the Vocative is only uſed in ſpeaking to Perſons, and that (as he adds) *none but Mad-men, or Poets ſometimes to Brutes or inanimate Creatures.* Was *Cicero* mad, when he ſaid, *Quid te, aſine, literas doceam?* And, *O vitæ, Philoſophia, ductrix*. And, *Vos Albani tumuli atque luci imploro.* Or, if a Maſter ſhould ſay to a lazy Scholar, *Ignave bubo*; or a Mother to her darling Child, *Mi pulcherrime columbule*; or an Admirer of *Homer*, *O Homere, flos nunquam moriture omnis eloquentiæ, fons inexhauſte ingeniorum*, ſhould they all be immediately ſent to Bedlam? And muſt we think, that one of the wiſeſt, as well as greateſt of all the *Roman* Emperors, in whoſe Time the *Latin* Tongue was brought to its higheſt Perfection, I mean, *Auguſtus Cæſar*, was frantick and beſide himſelf, when he wrote thus (as *Macrobius Saturnal.* ii. informs us) to his great Minion *Mæcenas*, *Vale mel gentium, delicie mas ſupernas, Cilniorum ſmaragde, jaſpi figulorum, berylle Porſenæ*, &c. But what will he ſay of the ſacred Writers, with whom ſuch Vocatives are very frequent? Perhaps the old Prophets, that often uſe them, will by him be ranked in the Number of Poets. But I tremble to think how he will apply his Doctrine to our Bleſſed Saviour himſelf, who directly, and without any poetical Turn, thought fit to ſpeak to inanimate Creatures, as to the *Sea*, the *Fig-tree*, and the like. And the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, tho' *Feſtus* the *Roman* Governor nor once ſaid to him, that *much Learning had made him mad*; yet however diſreſpectful the Expreſſion might otherwiſe ſeem, he was never reckoned mad for ſaying to the High-prieſt *Ananias*, as it is rendred in *Latin*, *Deus te percutiet, paries dealbate.*

§ 6. As to what he ſays, that Poets uſe ſuch Vocatives only ſometimes, that is, as I take it, but ſeldom; neither is that ſtrictly true. For Poets uſe them very frequently; and their ſo doing is accounted one of their chief Beauties. But whether they uſe them more or leſs frequently; is their Language not to be regarded in Gramm-

d, becauſe he very much ſlights and undervalues them, (as appears by what he ſays in his *Eſſay upon Study*, *p.* 194, *&c.* and elsewhere) muſt all the World do ſo too? No, truly, for ſo long there are polite People in it, a great Number of them will take pleaſure in reading ſuch Authors, and make it their Buſineſs to underſtand their Language, whether Mr. *Clarke*, and a thouſand ſuch Cenſors as he, will or not. Nor will they readily be much diverted from it, by what he may probably ſuggeſt, as his laſt Shift, in his Argument, namely, That all ſuch Vocatives, where Perſons are directly addreſt to, are *Proſopopee's*, and *figurative* Ways of ſpeaking, and therefore ought not to be made uſe of in Language. If this henceforth is to be the Rule, I am afraid, that not only *Poetry*, which cannot ſubſiſt without ſuch Figures, but *Rhetorick* alſo, of which they make the moſt ſhining and beautiful Part, muſt be baniſhed out of the World. That I am not here loading him with an unjuſt Charge, let Mr. *Locke*'s Words, which he makes his own, (*Eſſay on Educ.* p. 121.) bear Witneſs. "All the Art of Rhetorick, *ſays he*, beſides Order and Clearneſs, all the artificial and figurative Application of Words, Eloquence hath invented, being for nothing elſe but to inſinuate wrong Ideas, move the Paſſions, and thereby miſlead the Judgment, and ſo being perfect Cheat, ſhould be diſſallowed and diſcouraged." Why now, according to this Doctrine, we muſt have a new philoſophical Language contrived for us, wherein all Words ſhall have but one plain and uniform Signification; and no Names be given to Things, but what ſtrictly and properly belong to them. A dull Man muſt not henceforth be called *an Aſs*, nor a cunning Fellow *a Fox*, nor a lufty Drab *a Sow*, nor a Miſer *an Earth-worm*, nor a Fool *a ſenſeleſs Stock*, &c. We muſt not ſay in *Latin*, *Acerba mors*, *durus ſermo*, *altum ſilentium*, *ædificare claſſem*, *magna vis auri*, *manus juvenum*, *peſtis reipublicæ*, *ſitire ſanguinem*, *jugulum cauſæ petere*, *pabulum animæ*, and innumerable ſuch like. But let Mr. *Locke* or his diſciple Mr. *Clarke* talk what they will, there never was, nor will be ſuch a Languge upon Earth, intirely ſtript naked of ſuch Expreſſions as theſe: And if our Ideas of Things muſt be wrong, till ſuch Time as all Metaphors and other Figures be baniſhed from our Words, I will be ſo bold as to affirm, that we ſhall never have right Ideas or Conceptions at all. Language always has, and will be abuſed, whether the Words of it are uſed figuratively or otherwiſe; and it will not be by philoſophical Speculations, but by uſing Words, whether plain or figurative, in ſuch a Senſe as common Cuſtom has annexed to them, that ſuch an Abuſe can be rectified or removed. It is this Cuſtom or Uſe alone that gives Laws to all Languages, as well as to *Latin*; and he that would write a right Grammar of this laſt

laſt, muſt in every Thing conform it to, and be directed by it. S was therefore truly, tho' perhaps not decently enough, ſaid by a ancient Grammarian, M. *Pomponius Marcellus*, who when (as Su *ton*, in his Book *de illuſtribus Grammaticis*, cap. 22. informs us) had twitted the Emperor *Tiberius* for bad *Latin* he had ſpoken in certain Oration, and *Ateius Capito* had affirmed, that what the Em peror had ſaid, either was good *Latin*, or, if it was not, would b come ſo; made this Reply: *Certe jam indè mentitur Capito, tu nim, Cæſar, civitatem dare potes hominibus, verbis non potes.* Sin therefore it is more difficult *civitatem adimere, quàm dare*, how *ſurd* (that I may return Mr. *Clarke* his own Epithet) muſt it be him to remove a Caſe out of the *Latin* Tongue, which is eſſentia founded in the very Conſtitution of it? And how can he call *abſurd* in others, and *clogging the Declenſion* of Nouns with an u neceſſary Caſe, who could not but know that there is a vaſt Num ber of them, the Declenſion whereof cannot poſſibly be perform without it? But further, which is the greater *Clog* or *Abſurdity* here to call Things by their right Names, or to make a vaſt Number Nouns Monſters, by giving them two Heads, (for ſo I may ca two Nominatives) the former of which is deſigned for one Us the latter for another?

§ 7. This, one would think, Mr. *Clarke* himſelf was conſcio of, for ſpeaking of Interjections, *p.* 64. contrary to his own Schem he reſtores the Caſe he has here laid aſide, and ſays, that *O govern a Nominative, Accuſative, or Vocative*; as being afraid, if he had mitted the laſt, and mentioned only the Nominative and Accuſativ that, in ſuch Sentences as theſe, *O Rex benigne cœlitum, nos libe periculis*, and *His Rex benignus cœlitum nos liberat periculis*, the Sch lar ſhould think that the Adjective join'd to *Rex* had, in the maſc line Gender of its Nominative, two Terminations, *us* and *e*, a that he might uſe them promiſcuouſly, (as is done in the Accu tive of ſome, and the Ablative of many Nouns of the third Decl ſion) at his pleaſure: And, conſequentiy, that he might ſay, *O Re benignus cœlitum, nos libera periculis*, and *His Rex benigne cœlitum liberat periculis.* But, as the firſt of theſe cannot eaſily, and the ſecon not at all be allowed, he ought (to make his Doctrine agree wi itſelf) to have ſaid there, that O, put before Nouns or Adj ctives of the ſecond Declenſion in *us*, when uſed in *calling* or *ſpe ing to*, requires that Noun or Adjective to end in *e*. And, if ſo, ask what Caſe this Word in *e* is of? Not of the Vocative, to ſure, he having paſt an Act of Proſcription againſt that Caſe: An as he will as little ſay it is of any other of the oblique Caſes, it r mains, that either it muſt be of no Caſe, or of the Nominative. An if this laſt, it will follow, that as that Word has another Nomi

ive in *us*, to be made uſe of on other Occaſions; ſo it, and all of its Kind, muſt really have two diſtinct Nominatives, as different in the Uſes they are to be applied to, as any two Caſes whatſoever. This then being the State of the Matter, I leave it to the World to judge, which will moſt perplex and embaraſs the Declenſion of Nouns, *viz.* the conſtituting two ſeparate and diſtinct Caſes in *Name* as well as *Thing*, which will equally anſwer to all Sorts of Nouns, whatever Terminations they are of: Of the giving one *Name* to two *Things*, as really different from one another in their Uſes and Offices, as the Dative and Ablative, which of old (as is thought) univerſally had, and as yet, in a great Multitude of Nouns of the ſingular, and in all of them of the plural Number, have but one Termination. Since therefore Mr. *Clarke* has thought fit to deſtroy the *Name*, and (had he been able) the *Being* too of a Vocative Caſe from the *Latin* Tongue, he did well, in that Reſpect, to call his Grammar *a new one*: For what he has advanced upon that Head is ſo new and unheard of, that I may ſafely undertake for him, that as no one ever dreamt of it before him, ſo he will retain the unſullied Glory of it to his own peculiar ſelf through all ſucceeding Generations. But it is high Time to put an end to this Diſquiſition concerning the *Vocative*; which I would not have ſo long inſiſted upon, had it not been to prevent ſome of my Readers from being impoſed upon, or carried away by Mr. *Clarke*'s Authority, in what I reckon (not a ſmall *Nicety* and *Punctilio*, as he calls ſome very uſeful Things, but) a chief and fundamental Point in *Latin* Grammar. I proceed now in my other Remarks on his Performance.

§ 7. Page 4. *med.* He tells us, That *Nouns making* i *in the Ablative, as alſo ſuch as end in two Conſonants*, &c. *make the Genitive plural end in* ium. But what are theſe Nouns that have *i* in their Ablative? He mentions indeed, a little before, ſix Words in *is* that have *i* in their Ablative. But are theſe all, or even the greateſt Part of them? What thinks he of Words in *e*, as *Altare*, *bovile*, *collare*, *enclave*, *cubile*, *fœnile*, *haſtile*, *mantile*, *mare*, *milliare*, *monile*, *ulcrale*, *ovile*, *præſepe*, *ramale*, *rete*, *ſedile*, and a great many more? and of Nouns in *al* and *ar*, as *Animal*, *cervical*, *tribunal*, *toral*, *ſcutigal*; and *Alvear*, *calcar*, *cochlear*, *exemplar*, *lacunar*, *lupanar*, *pulvinar*, *torcular*, with ſeveral others, which have their Ablative in *i*. Now theſe, not taken notice of by him to have *i* in their Ablative, ought therefore (as *Exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis*) to have, according to him, *e* in their Ablative, and, by conſequence, *um* not *ium* in their Genitive plural.

Ibid. lin. 18. He excepts from the immediately preceeding Rule, *Caliens*, *cœlebs*, *forceps*, *hyems*, *municeps*, *particeps*, *princeps*, and all

Greek

Greek Nouns ending in two Conſonants, which make the Genitive plural end in *um*, as, *hyemum*, *forcipum*, &c. as alſo *canis*, *panis*, *vates*, &c. I obſerve here, 1. *Cliens*, tho' it has only *cliente*, for ought I know, in the Ablative, yet it has *clientium* in the Genitive plural, *clientum* being rather to be imputed to a *Syncope* than to its true Manner of Declenſion in that Caſe: For ſo *Plautus*, *Horace*, *Sueton*, *Curtius*, *Saluſt* and *Seneca* uſe it. 2. I doubt if ever Mr. *Clarke* ſaw *hyemum*, ſome of the beſt Grammarians taking Notice of it as wanting that Caſe. And perhaps the ſame may be ſaid of *cælibum*; which therefore, in a Compend ſuch as his is, had been better omitted. 3. Of theſe he ought to have mentioned as Exceptions from his preceeding Rule, he hath omitted more than he hath ſet down, of more at leaſt as common Uſe as moſt of theſe he hath named; as, *vigil*, *vetus*, *uber*, *inops*, *ſupplex*, *memor*, *conſors*, *pugil*, *celer*, *degener*, *artifex*, *anceps*, *præceps*, *biceps*, *triceps*, *manceps*, *auceps*: Not to mention all Comparatives, except *plus*. But he will ſay, that his Example of *major*, p. 16. will ſerve theſe laſt, and the *&c.* for the reſt. I ſhall allow the former to a Compendizer: But as for ſuch *&* *cetera's*, Boys will not know what to make of them. 4. In none of his Rules has he taken Notice of theſe Nouns, *As*, *mas*, *vas*, *-dis*; as alſo, *Bes*, *caro*, *cor*, *cos*, *dos*, *faux*, *glis*, *lis*, *lar*, *linter*, *mus*, *nix*, *nox*, *os*, *oſſis*; *Quiris*, *Samnis*, *uter*: Which have all *ium* in their Genitive plural; but, according to him, ſhould have *um*; ſince his two Examples, *pater* and *tempus*, as they have *e* in their Ablative ſingular, ſo they have *um* not *ium* in their Genitive plural; and, by conſequence, theſe Nouns I have mentioned, as they agree with his Examples in the former, ſo ought they in the latter; unleſs (which he has not done) he had told us the contrary.

§ 8. Page 5. *init.* He mentions a Thing very unuſual, and almoſt only to be found in very ancient Authors, that *adventus*, *fructus*, &c. make the Genitive ſingular end ſometimes in *i*, (as was hinted at above, *p.* 22.) and omits to mention that theſe, and ſuch like Words, had alſo ſometimes *uis* in that Genitive, with theſe ſame Authors; and, which was more uſual even among the beſt Authors, that Nouns of this Declenſion have their Dative in *u*.

Page 7. Among Doubtfuls in *us* of the ſecond and fourth Declenſions, he excepts *penus* and *ſpecus*; and then he adds, that theſe two Nouns *are to be ſeen in one or other of all the three Genders*: But where did he ſee them neuter, but when of the third Declenſion?

Page 10. l. 10. Contrary to all Reaſon he makes *Scobs* of the maſculine Gender: Which (or *Stobis*, as they oftner write it) all good Authors, as *Celſus*, viii. 2. *Columella*, vii. 10. *Pliny*, xxxiv. ii. and elſewhere, uſe in the Feminine. *Palladius* indeed, a Writer of the lower Character, has *lib.* iii. *tit.* 17. *Eructo omni ſcobe*, in the maſculine

culine. But, as he is there referring to a Paſſage in *Columella*, iv. 29. where that Author uſes it in the Feminine, it is probable that it may be an Error of the Tranſcriber, and not of *Palladius* himſelf, for *eductâ*. This is certain, that *Priſcian*, p. 751. and after him *Voſſius* and *Urſin*, make it only Feminine.

Ibid. l. 25. He reckons Words in *u* to be of the third Declenſion, which not Grammarians only, but Children know to be of the fourth.

Page 11. l. 6. Lagopus *too, are Females all,*
Tho' all the reſt in pus *are male,*
Excepting corpus, opus, tempus.

One would think, by theſe Words [*all the reſt*] that there was a good Number of them; but I know none worth mentioning (in a Compend at leaſt) but *tripus*, or perhaps *chitropus*, tho' this laſt has no better Authority than the *vulgate Bible*, and *daſypus* a Kind of Hare, or ſome other Animal mentioned by *Pliny*, and which may come under his firſt general Rule. As for *chenopus*, or rather *echinopus*, a Kind of Herb, mentioned by the ſame Author, it is feminine by his own general Rule, *p.* 8. And *polypus* for the moſt Part, and *coronopus*, always are of the ſecond Declenſion. As for *cynopus*, which ſome cite from the ſame *Pliny*, for the Name of a Fiſh, *lib.* 32. *cap. ult.* it is not to be found in the beſt MSS. as *Harduin* obſerves. But here he omits a Word more common than any of them, *viz. pus puris*, which is of the neuter Gender, tho', according to him, it ought to be maſculine, as not excepted from Nouns in *pus*, which are all maſculine, *ſays he*, excepting *corpus, opus, tempus*; and in his Introduction, *p. ult.* even theſe laſt are alſo omitted.

And here I cannot, before I go farther, but ſtop a little to ſhew my great Surprize at the extraordinary Aſſurance of our Author, who, in the Cloſe of the Preface to the 6th, 7th, and 8th Editions of his *Introduction*, after he has told, that, for theſe Rules of his for the Gender of Nouns, he was chiefly obliged to the learned Grammarian Mr. *Johnſon*; immediately adds, "That he hopes this "Piece of Grammar (*which is the ſame almoſt in this as in that* "*Perſormance*) will be found to be the moſt methodical, eaſy and "comprehenſive Thing of the Kind that hath yet been publiſhed." But how much his Hopes have herein deceived him, and how far his Account he gives of the Genders of Nouns, is removed from being methodical, eaſy and comprehenſive, is apparent from the few Notes juſt now ſet down, but eſpecially from what I have ſaid above. *p.* 6 and 7. wherein are remarked ſuch groſs Errors and Omiſſions in the Genders of ſome of the moſt common Nouns, as are

not to be met with in any Grammar. Can any Thing be leſs methodical or comprehenſive, than to bring in theſe Nouns under his Exceptions, which are already comprehended under his general Rules, as *optio*, *pumilio*, *puſio*, *burdo*, *caſtos*, *bos*, *gigas*, *aries*, *verres* and *præs*? Can any Thing be leſs comprehenſive or eaſy, than to give Boys ſuch fallacious Rules, as will miſlead them in the moſt ordinary Words, as *pelagus*, *virus*, *vulgus*, *pus*, (and in his Introduction, *corpus*, *opus*, *tempus*) *carbo*, *mucro*, [illegible], *pulmo*, *temo*, &c. *crinis*, *ignis*, *panis*; *fornax*, *forfex*, *ſilex*, *cortex*, *obex*, &c. *lien*, *ren*, *ſplen*, *delphin*, *canon*, &c? But of this too much: I proceed,

§ 10. Page 12. His Heteroclites are ſo ſlightly and careleſly ſet down, that he might as well have quite let them alone, as he tells us in his *Preſ.* p. 15. he would have done, had it not been for the Sake of weak Readers. Some Words he mentions that are no where to be found, as *Averni*, *ſupellectilia*, *cæla*, *fili* and *capiſtri*, in the plural Number, as was before obſerved, *p.* 8. And of theſe that ought to be ranked among Heteroclites, he omits the far greater Number, tho' ſeveral of theſe were as much worth noticing as thoſe he has mentioned. See above *ibid.*

§ 11. *Page* 15. *lin.* 1. We have another Inſtance of affected Singularity in our Author. For there he tells us, that Adjectives are of two Sorts, ſuch as have three Terminations, and ſuch as have but two. And in the following *Page*, the firſt Example he gives us of this ſecond Sort is *Felix*. All Grammarians that I know of, before him, taught that there were ſome Adjectives of one Termination only, ſuch as this ſame *Felix*, which, *he ſays*, has two Terminations. He takes his Terminations, it ſeems, from ſome other Caſe than the Nominative ſingular, as all the World did before him: And here probably from the Accuſative of that Number. Why did he not the ſame with Subſtantives? And becauſe he loves not to *clog* the Declenſions with any Thing not very neceſſary, why did he not make all the five Declenſions to have but three Terminations, *am*, *um* and *em*, for ſo generally end all their Accuſatives, except the Nouns happen accidentally to be of the neuter Gender; which is a Thing not much to be regarded in a ſhort Compend like his. Nay, if the Accuſative is to be the Standard of the Terminations, he might have made all Adjectives (excepting ſome few irregular ones) of two Terminations: For *bonus*, *niger*, and the like, have no more in that Caſe. And if he had gone a little farther to the Dative plural, (for after he has left the Nominative ſingular, it is no great Matter which Caſe he pitches on for the Termination) he might have found, that in that Caſe they had all but one Termination. But it would ſeem, that, next to the Nominative, (to whom, as the firſt-born, he would give the double Portion, by add-

g to it what in all Ages before belong'd to the Vocative) he has greateſt Regard to the Accuſative. For, as he has in all his Exples, thruſt the Genitive and Dative out of that Place of Dignity, ich by the Preſcription of at leaſt 1700 Years they peaceably ſſeſt, of ſtanding next to the Nominative, and ranked the Accuſae before them; ſo, for an additional Mark of his Eſteem, he h made it the Standard of the Termination of Adjectives, and orred its elder Brother the Nominative (tho' otherwiſe a favourite ſe) to content it ſelf with the Termination of Subſtantives. *Diyſius* the famous Tyrant of *Syracuſe*, when baniſhed from his ngdom he thought fit to commence a Schoolmaſter, that he ght ſtill have ſomething (as *Tully Tuſcul. Diſput.* III. 12. ſuppoſes) exerciſe his deſpotick Power upon, yet for ought we read, was ver ſo arbitrary in this his new Government, as either to deſtroy y of the Caſes, or diveſt them of the Rank they formerly poſſeſt: t however ſevere he might be to his Diſciples, yet we are no here told, that ever he broke in upon the fundamental Conſtitun of the Art, but left the whole Frame of it, with all its Parts d Pertinents, ſafe and intire as he found it.

Pag. 17. *l.* 1. He ſays, that "MOST Adjectives whoſe Signifi-cation may increaſe or be diminiſhed, form Degrees of Compariſon." If he means that they have derivative Adjectives formed nt them, ending in *or*, *rimus*, *ſſimus*, &c. the Thing is very far m being true. See *Johnſon's Gramm. Comment. p.* 119, *&c.* d *Ruddim. Gramm. maj. p.* 181. *ſeqq.* But if his Meaning is, t they form Degrees of Compariſon, either in the Manner juſt w mentioned, or by the Addition of the Adverbs *magis* and *maxi*, the Word MOST is quite out of Purpoſe; all Adjectives, whoſe nification may increaſe or be diminiſhed, being capable of Degrees Compariſon one or other of thoſe Ways.

Ibid. l. 4. He makes but two Degrees of Compariſon, the *Comative* and *Superlative*, excluding the *Poſitive*, which by moſt mmarians was always reckoned one of thoſe Degrees of Compan. I own, that ſtrictly ſpeaking, there is no Compariſon in the itive: But as it is the Foundation of the other two Degrees, and Thing is thereby rendred more intelligible to young ones, I nk it is better to allow it to paſs for one of theſe Degrees; in the e Manner that the *Nominative* is called one, and the firſt of the ſes, tho' it does not fall [*cadat*] from any other Word, as the me of *Caſus* would import.

Page 19. *l.* 4. He will needs give a Specimen of his Philoſophick ent, (tho' one would have thought it might have been reſerved a more proper Place, than here to be thrown away upon unking Boys, in a ſhort Compend of Grammar:) Namely, by acquainting

quainting them, that *amo* and *audio* are not in Truth and Reality active Verbs, and that it is *a vulgar groſs Way of Conception*, to reckon them ſuch. But whatever may be ſaid for *audio*, (tho' one that liſtens *arrectis auribus*, as the Phraſe is, and with a very ſerious Attention, may in that reſpect be not improperly accounted active) yet I am pretty poſitive, that the Verb *Amo*, always, and in the ſtricteſt Philoſophical Propriety of the Word, ſignifies Action. For tho' *Amor* or *Love*, is commonly call'd a *Paſſion*, the firſt Impreſſions being in a Manner involuntary, and the Perſon affected by it ſo far *paſſive*; yet whenever he can truly pronounce the Word *Amo*, he that Moment becomes *active*; and his Will being inſpired as it were by that vigorous Principle, carries it ſelf forth (with an Activity not to be equall'd almoſt by that of any other Verb whatſoever) to the Enjoyment of the beloved Object. But our learned Author it ſeems, is like to take up with that Piece of modern Philoſophy of ſome, who teach that there is no ſuch Thing as humane Liberty in the World, and that the Will being ſwallowed up in, or governed by the Underſtanding, which is a Principle intirely paſſive, it can properly have no Activity at all. At this Rate, as all rational Creatures, and much more the irrational and inanimate ones, cannot properly be ſaid *to act*, but only *to be acted upon*, there ſhall henceforth be left no Verbs that can in reality be called *active*, either in the *Latin*, or in any other Language whatſoever. But as it is as foreign to my Purpoſe to purſue further this Diſpute, as it was idle in Mr. *Clarke* to broach it, I paſs to a Thing wherein *Latin* Grammar is not only directly concerned, but which (as I take it) is of as great Importance to have rightly clear'd up and determined, as any one Thing in that Language; and that is the Number and Uſe of the *Supines*.

§ 11. *Page* 21. *l.* 6. Mr. *Clarke* in the Conjugation of Verbs has dropt the Supines, and in Place thereof brought in two Participles for each Voice. In this indeed he does not ſtand ſingle (as he did in the *Vocative*, and ſome other Things mentioned before) but has been led into it by the Example or Authority of Mrs. *Johnſon* and *Lowe*, who have likewiſe in the Formation of Verbs laid aſide theſe Supines; and Dr. *Shaw* ſeems alſo to be of the ſame Opinion. As I look upon this as one of the greateſt and moſt daring Encroachments that ever was made upon the Conſtitution of the Language, and purpoſe (ſo far as I am able) to reſtore the *Supines*, eſpecially the firſt of them, to that Place in it, from which theſe learned Men would unjuſtly degrade them; I muſt beg my Reader's Pardon and Patience, that in the due Proſecution of this Argument, I ſhall be obliged to carry my Diſcourſe to a greater Length than otherwiſe were to be wiſh'd. And here (tho' that was always thought of ſo

We

eight with moderate Men) I ſhall not much inſiſt upon the com-
on and univerſal Cuſtom of all former Grammarians, who con-
ntly gave the firſt Supine a principal Place in the Formation and
njugation of Verbs. This, I am well aware, will have no Influ-
ce upon Mr. *Clarke*, but rather a contrary Effect. For in his
eface, *p.* 4. he tells us, " That common Cuſtom, in moſt Caſes
of Importance, is ſo far from being the Rule of Right, that it is
the very Reverſe of it." *i. e.* as I underſtand him, *becauſe it is
mmon, it bids fair for being wrong.* We muſt therefore talk no
ger of old vulgar Cuſtoms, the very Name whereof is ſo offen-
e to our Author: That which now only remains for us to do, is
conſider his and Mr. *Johnſon*'s Reaſoning in this Matter. As to
at he himſelf ſays, it hardly deſerves the Name of Reaſoning,
ng rather a bare Affirmation without Proof. " From ſome few
Verbs, *ſays he*, *p.* 31. are formed too a Sort of Verbal Nouns
called *Supines*, two in Number; of which *few* Verbs, ſome form
the one, and ſome the other, but *very few* indeed both; and the
few Supines too there are in the *Latin* Tongue, are but *very rare-
ly* uſed:" And then he adds the Supines of *audio*, *auditum* and
ditu; omitting thoſe of *amo*, *doceo*, and *lego*, as if theſe were not
be uſed; tho' yet, when he comes to the future of the Infinitive
ſſive, he takes in theſe Supines of which it is made up, *amatum
doctum iri*, and *lectum iri*, as if the adding of *iri* to them hin-
d them from being Supines. In Conſequence of this Doctrine,
59. he forms (contrary to all former Practice) the Participle of
e Preterperfect Tenſe from the Preterperfect Tenſe of the Indica-
e active; and again *p.* 63, he forms the *few Supines*, which he
s are in the *Latin* Tongue, from that Participle. This is all we
e from Mr. *Clarke* on that Subject: But Mr. *Johnſon* in his
ammat. Comment. p. 386 and 387, ſets himſelf formally to ar-
e the Point; and the Sum of his Reaſoning is founded upon this
e Principle of his, that no *Latin* Words are to be uſed but what
e found in Authors, whence he infers (and I cannot ſay unjuſtly,
his general Propoſition is true) that all *Supines* that are not actual-
o be found in thoſe Authors ought to be diſcarded, and that
oever makes uſe of ſuch, does ſo far offer Violence to the Puri-
of that Language. In Conſequence of this Tenet, he maintains,
t tho' we find Participles in *urus* from ſuch and ſuch Verbs, as
rticularly *caleo*, *careo*, *doleo*, *jaceo*, &c. yet that is no ſufficient
aſon for the Uſe of the Supines, *calitum*, *caritum*, *dolitum*, *ja-
m*, &c. no more than it is for the uſing of *ſuppetiarum* and *ſup-
is*, that we find *ſuppetiæ* and *ſuppetias*, and the like.

§ 12. Having thus, I think, fairly ſtated the Matter, I come next
the particular Conſideration of Mr. *Johnſon*'s Argument. And to

it

it I anſwer, 1. That if we are henceforth to be directed by his R
I may cry out with the Poet,

Quàm temere in noſmet legem ſancimus iniquam!

For if we are to make Uſe of no Words, in all the various P
through which they may be declin'd, but what we find in the f
Roman Authors that are now remaining: It cannot fail but that
muſt be extremely fetter'd and conſtrain'd in the free Uſe of ſp
ing and writing *Latin*. For at this Rate, it is certain that the
greater Part of Nouns, and probably almoſt all Verbs, will be fou
deficient one Way or other. And if we cannot uſe *amatum*, *doc*
lectum, and innumerable other Supines, becauſe not to be met w
in any Author, we ought for the ſame Reaſon, to abſtain from
ruptelarum, *veri*, *pugionum*, *regiminibus*, *bures*, *adamantas*, *am*
tui, *crepitui*, *latratuum*, *vomituum*, *anibus*, *ſocribus*, &c. from
ruptela, *ver*, *pugio*, &c. as alſo *amaveratis*, *docebimini*, *legerem*
audiuntor, &c. and innumerable ſuch like; all or moſt of which,
very much doubt, are not to be found in theſe Authors. And wh
will become of the Termination *minor*, which both Mr. *John*
and Mr. *Clarke* bring into their *Paradigmata* of the Conjugation
of which, by the Confeſſion of the former, there are only two
ſtances extant.

§ 13. But 2. If it ſhall be ſaid, that *Analogy* will bear us ou
theſe Things, I anſwer that the ſame will in a great Meaſure h
for *Supines*. For who can aſſure us, that theſe ancient Writers
purpoſely avoid all ſuch Supines, as are not to be found in M
Johnſon's Liſt. *p.* 388 *& ſeqq.*? And if *abſolutum*, *inquiſitum*,
ſtructum, *perturbatum*, *præpoſitum*, *recuperatum*, *ſupplicatum*, *t*
tatum, which he mentions there, had not been found, would
therefore be unlawful to uſe them? In his *Additions* and *Emen*
tions to his *Commentaries*, he gives us a large Supplement of Supi
he had overlook'd in his former Liſt: and then tells us there *p.*
that *the Reader, he believes, will find but very few more.* Bu
am afraid, that he is not much more exact in his Calculation he
than he is in the Number of verbal and other Adjectives that
conſtrued with the Genitive, which, in his *Noctes Nottinghamicæ*,
16, he tells us are about a hundred and ſeven; whereas Mr. R
diman in his large Grammar hath *p.* 74 and 75, diſcovered as m
ny more, as theſe he hath mentioned. But whatever is in tha
am ſure that by reading accidentally ſome Parts only of ſome
theſe Authors, I my ſelf have found ſeverals, which neither he
both his Liſts, nor Dr. *Shaw* in his Grammatical Dictionary h
taken any Notice of; ſuch as,

Aquatum ire, Liv. xxxi. 4. *egreſſus*, Salluſt. Jug. xc. 2.
Cognitum promiſſa miſit, Sall. Jug. xciii. 7.
Conductum coquum veniunt, Plaut. Pſeud. iii. 2. 15.
Confectum iri, Cic. Attic. xi. 13.
Coquinatum veni, Plaut. Aul. iii. 1.
Conſervatum ſocios pergit. A. Gell. vii. 3.
Deſperatum iri. Cic. Attic. xi. 13.
Diſceptatum arcceſſeretur, Liv. xxxv. 33.
Diſſuaſum prodeuntibus, Liv. iii. 63.
Egreſſu rarus Cæſar, Tacit. Ann. xv. 53.
Excubitum mittere, Sall. Jug. c. 4.
Exitu fœdum, Liv. Præf.
Fututum ire, Martial. xi. 8.
Inceptu fœdum, Liv. Præf.
Luſum it Mæcenas. Horat. Sat. i. 5. 48.
Legatum iri, Cic. ad Q. Fr. iii. 1. 5.
Madefactum iri, Cic. Divin. i. 32.
Obſcuratum iri, Cic. de Amic. c. 17.
Obſecratum venerant, Cic. Piſon. c. 31.
Obſonatu redeo, Plaut. Menæch. ii. 2. 14.
Obſeſſum turrim regiam proficiſcitur. Sall. Jug. ciii. 1.
Oppreſſum iri, Lactant. Div. Inſtit. iii. 1.
Oppugnatum iſſent, Liv. xxxvi. 3.
Potum age capellas, Virg. Ecl. ix. 24.
Potu ſuaviſſimæ aquæ, Plin. xix. 11.
Profatu tetræ voces, A. Gell. xviii. 11.
Proſpeculatum mittunt, Liv. iii. 43.
Proventu teleres uvæ, Plin. xiv. 3.
Relictum iri, Salluſt. Jug. cxii. extr.
Sponſum deſcendam, Senec. de Benef. IV. 39. *Sponſum mittis*, &c. vid. Amor. i. 13. 19. V. Burm. in loc.
Suſceptu honeſta, Lactant. Div. Inſtit. i. 1.
Tardatum iri, Colum. R. R. i. Præf. prope fin.
Trucidatum iri, Cic. Divin. ii. 9.
Tutatum regnum arma ſumpſiſſe, Sall. Jug. cii. 12. V. Cort. in loc.
Venatu rediturus, Stat. Achil. i. 120.
Uſurpatum iſſet, Gell. iii. 2.

I do not in the leaſt doubt, but that a great many more not particularly adverted to, lie ſcattered here and there among thoſe thors: which yet (till they are diſcovered) all ſuch as are to be erned by Mr. *Johnſon* and Mr. *Clarke*'s Maxims and Authority,

muſt, whatever Need they may otherwiſe have for them, conſcientiouſly abſtain from. But let them and their Followers be as ſcrupulous (ſuperſtitious I ſhould rather call it) in that Matter as they pleaſe; one Thing I am ſure of, that, as the Phraſe is, *Summos illos Latini ſermonis inſtauratores & imitatores nunquam ea religio tenuit.* They were better acquainted with the moſt inward Frame and Conſtitution of the Language, than almoſt any now are; and yet we do not find that ever they carried the Matter to ſuch a Pitch of Niceneſs and Scrupuloſity as theſe Gentlemen would have done. I ſhall inſtance in one of them, the famous *Sebaſtian Caſtellio*, who, tho' he pick'd himſelf as much on the Purity and Propriety of his Diction as any perhaps among them, yet made no Difficulty to make uſe of a great many Supines, merely on the Foot of Analogy, which no ancient Author (for ought he knew) had uſed before him. That therefore it may appear, what his Opinion, (and I may add that of other learned Men of his Time) was concerning this Matter, I have thought fit to excerpt out of his Verſion of the firſt five Books of the *New Teſtament*, a pretty conſiderable Number of Supines, which are not to be found (I will not ſay, in the old Claſſicks, for that as yet we are by no Means ſure of, but) in all the Liſts of Supines which theſe Gentlemen have given us.

Adoratum eum veniſſe, Matth. ii. 2.
Afflictum iri, Act. vii. 6.
Annunciatum i Dei regnum, Luc. ix. 60.
Aſcitum vadit alios ſpiritus, Matth. xii. 45.
Avolutum lapidem venerat, Matth. xxviii. 2.
Baptizatum aquâ veni, Joan. i. 31.
Captum conſilium iverunt, Matth. xxii. 15.
Cavatum terram ivit, Matth. xxv. 18.
Circumciſum puerum iverunt, Luc. i. 59.
Conciliatum pacem non veni, Matth. x. 34.
Confeſſum ſua facta veniebant, Act. xix. 18.
Commoratum ivit, Mar. ii. ult.
Declaratum rem omnem iverunt, Matth. xvi. 31.
Decollatum Joannem miſit, Matth. xiv. 10.
Deſcenſum venit, Luc. xix. 37.
Doctum vadite omnes gentes, Matth. xxviii. 19.
Expertum ea eo, Luc. xiv. 19.
Evocatum virum tuum i, Joan. iv. 16.
Fruſtratum iri, Matth. x. ult.
Hauſtum aquam venit, Joan. iv. 7.
Impoſitum ei manum tuam veni, Matth. ix. 18.
Injectum veni ignem in terram, Luc. xii. 49.

Interfectum pueros miſit, Marc. ii. 16.
Lectum eas eamus, Matth. xiii. 28.
Lotum ut iret juſſit, Joan. ix. 7.
Miniſtratum eis veniet, *Luc.* xii. 37.
Munitum id ite, Matth. xxvii. 65.
Negotiatum ea ivit, Matth. xxv. 16.
Nidificatum veniant, Matth. xiii. 32.
Oblatum i munus tuum, Matth. v. 24.
Obrutum humi ivit, Matth. xxv. 25.
Oſtenſum i te ſacerdoti, Mar. i. 44.
Paratum vias ejus Domino præibis, Luc. i. 76.
Perfectum iri, Luc. i. 45.
Præbitum honorem venerunt, Matth. xiv. 33.
Præfocatum ſe laqueo ivit, Matth. xxvii. 5.
Præparatum Paſcha eamus, Mar. xiv. 12.
Preſſum iri, Act. vii. 6.
Publicatum emendationis vitæ baptiſma venit, Luc. iii. 3.
Renunciatum ibant, Matth. xxviii. 9.
Reprehenſum i eum, Matth. xvi. 15.
Sanatum ſuum ſervum ut veniret, Luc. vii. 3.
Satum malas herbas ivit, Matth. xiii. 25.
Sepultum meum patrem ut eam, Luc. ix. 59.
Sequutum me venito, Mar. x. 21.
Surreptum eum eant, Matth. xxvii. 64.
Significatum illi miſerunt, Joan. xi. 3.
Venditum it ſuas facultates, Matth. xiii. 44.
Vexatum nos veniſti, Matth. viii. 29.
Unctum eum ut irent, Mar. xvi. 1.
Vocatum inſontes non veni, Mar. ii. 17.

ſuch a Number of Supines, for which perhaps we cannot vouch uthority from ancient Authors, are to be found in ſo ſmall a Part *Caſtellio*'s Works, what might not be expected to caſt up in his her Writings, and the Writings of the other learned Men of his ime, if any ſhould be ſo idle as to ſearch for them.

§ 14. 3. As to what Mr. *Johnſon* tells us, that none of the an- nt Authors ſay *Curro calitum*, *Non facile calitu*, or *Propero cari- m*: I anſwer, Perhaps it may be ſo, in all that we now have their Writings. But can he or any Man living be abſolutely rtain, that they never ſpoke ſo in all their innumerable Books that e loſt, or that they could not do it without violating the Purity of eir Language? *Plautus*, I am ſure, and ſome others of them, ve as odd Ways of ſpeaking as any of theſe: And I do not ſee a ry remarkable Difference betwixt *Imuſne ſeſſum*, *Jube ad te veni-*

am meridiatum, Quin comiſſatum ad fratrem imus, Sperabat eo a
no debellatum iri. Reſpondit nihil ipſi nocitum iri, Difficilis collect
Difficilia migratu, Blandamque precatu Antigonem; (for all which
we have Examples in good Authors:) And *Eamus calitum, H*
ferrum non eſt facile calitu, Hoc pacto re ſamaque caritum iri denu
tiabat.

§ 15. 4. But let it be granted that there are ſome few of theſe Su
pines of ſuch a particular Nature and Make, that they cannot be co
gruouſly uſed in Diſcourſe, muſt therefore the general Rule of Anal
gy for forming Supines, and which will hold with Reſpect to th
Bulk of them, be laid aſide? This Mr. *Johnſon* himſelf is ſo f
from condemning, that, "I confeſs, *ſays he*, I do not ſee an
"Harm of allowing theſe analogical Formations, but rather a gre
"Convenience, ſince ſo many Rules concerning the Irregulari
"of the ſeveral Parts of Speech would thereby be avoided."
And to the ſame Purpoſe he ſpeaks, *p.* 377. By the by I m
obſerve, that Mr. *Clarke*, however he agrees with him in th
main Point, yet has thought fit to differ from Mr. *Johnſon*
this Particular. For Mr. *Johnſon*, we ſee, not only allows, b
thinks there is a great Convenience in the analogical Formation
the Participle of the preterite Tenſe, and of the future active, fro
the Supine: But Mr. *Clarke*, who is mighty fond of making ne
Improvements, will needs form, *inverſo rerum ordine*, the Supi
from the preterite Participle. But, to return to Mr. *Johnſon*, th
it would ſeem at firſt that this Conceſſion of his was a pretty lib
ral one, yet he takes care that we ſhall not be much the richer b
it. For immediately he adds, "Provided this Matter were judi
"ouſly ſtated, and agreed to by learned Men. But till then, *ſa*
"*he*, he that ſhall uſe it (i. e. *this Rule of analogical Formation. a*
"*conclude that ſuch Verbs as have a Participle in* urus, *may ha*
"*alſo the Supine from which that Participle is formed*) will but e
"poſe himſelf to publick Scorn." Mr. *Johnſon*'s Labours have bee
I own, of very conſiderable Uſe to the Publick, (*neque enim be*
facta malignè detrectare meum eſt:) But it will not be He, and
few Followers He may have in ſome ſingular Things, that will co
ſtitute the Publick. For, as the Publick, to a Man, down to his Ti
thought that Rule of Analogy a very good one, and that they mig
ſafely uſe it without any Fear of being expoſed to Scorn eith
publick or private; ſo I am hopeful, that what I already have, a
further am to ſay on this Head, ſhall do much to ſecure thoſe of n
Opinion from all publick Reproach: And as to private Scorn, (wh
there is no guarding againſt) we muſt take our Fate, and not abo
don what we believe to be right, tho' we may be thereby expo
to the Laughter of ſome conceited Men. But Mr. *Johnſon* w
ki

ind as to make ſome Sort of Apology for thoſe before him, as not nowing better till he ſhould teach them. " For however, *ſays he*, this Matter came to ſlip the Obſervation of moſt (he might as well have ſaid all) of thoſe learned Men who have wrote upon this Subject, whether out of Incogitancy, or that by Miſtake they thought that Supines were read from all Verbs, ſave thoſe few which they except; I ſay, however this were, yet they all agree, that there is nothing to be attempted in this Kind, but what is to be found in Authors." If this is all the Apology he is to make or thoſe learned Grammarians that wrote before him, he might ave kept it to himſelf: For I am ſure they will not think themelves in the leaſt indebted to him for it. Whatever *Incogitancy* or *Miſtake* they might be guilty of in this Matter, it did not, as he would have it, ly in this, that they thought that Supines were read rom all Verbs, ſave thoſe few which they except: And as little lid they all agree that no Supines were to be made uſe of, but what were to be found in Authors. All this is pure Fiction and Dream. They gave Supines to innumerable Verbs, nay and, to ſome, Preerites too, which they very well knew were not to be found in hoſe ancient Authors. They had, as is plain from their own Writngs, a quite different Notion of theſe Matters. For diſcovering whether a Verb had a Supine or not, and what that Supine was, they lid not, as Mr. *Johnſon* and his Followers, make a Search for the upine itſelf in theſe Authors, but thought it ſufficient for their Purpoſe to obſerve the two Participles that are formed from it; concluding by the general Laws of Analogy, that if theſe laſt, or either f them was to be found in Authors, the Supine, whence they had heir Original, tho' not found, was really contained in the Language, nd might, upon the Main, when a fit Occaſion required it, be ſafey made uſe of. Hence it is, that, not to mention others, *Priſcian*, ne of the greateſt and moſt accurate among them, when, *lib.* ix. nd x. he applies himſelf to the fixing and aſcertaining the Pretetites and Supines of Verbs, tho' he frequently gives Examples of he former from good Authors; yet ſcarce ever does he give an Inance of a Supine itſelf, but inſtead thereof he brings, as a ſufficint Voucher for it, one or more Examples of the above mentioned articiples: In which Kind of Quotations he is very full and copius. 'Tis therefore ſo far from being true, what Mr. *Johnſon* alledes, that all theſe learned Men do agree that no Supines are to be made ſe of, but what are to be found in Authors, that it never entred to their Minds, and he (I believe) is the firſt who ever maintaind ſuch a Doctrine. The *Latin*, tho' a pure and chaſte Language, not an humourſom and a fantaſtical one; and thoſe ancient and her Grammarians knew it better, than to imagine that *nothing was*

to be attempted in it, but what had a preciſe and formal Authority even to the leaſt Punctilio, to ſupport it. Can it be thought that they would be ſo ſcrupulous, or rather capricious, as to allow *comiſſatum*, *eſum*, and not *cœnatum* or *pranſum*; *famulatum*, *ſervitum*, and not *mandatum*, *imperatum*; *emptum* and not *venditum*; *laudatum* and not *culpatum*; *militatum* and not *pacatum* or *armatum*; *natatum* and not *ſubmerſum*; *ploratum* and not *riſum*; *ſeſſum*, *ambulatum*, *meridiatum*, and not *excitatum*, *equitatum*, *pernoctatum*; *vapulatum* and not *verberatum*; *conductum* and not *locatum*, *furtum* and not *reſtitutum*; *coctum* and not *frixum*; *cacatum*, *mictum*, and not *amatum*, *doctum*; and innumerable others, merely becauſe they found Examples of the former, and not of the latter, in good Authors? If ſuch a rigorous Law as this is to be made the eſtabliſhed Rule for ſpeaking or writing *Latin* aright, it will be the moſt difficult Thing in the World: For by the ſame Parity of Reaſon, we ſhall never be allowed to uſe the oblique Caſes of any Noun, or the Parts of any Verb, but what we find in ſome Author before us; and at this Rate (becauſe it is impoſſible for the greateſt Humaniſt that ever was born otherwiſe to know them) we muſt have a new Sort of Dictionary, or rather Concordance of the *Latin* Tongue, compoſed, in which not only the *Themata Nominum & Verborum*, as they are called, but alſo the moſt minute Branches of them, together with their proper Documents and Vouchers, muſt be diſtinctly and accurately ſet down. But ſuppoſing that ſuch a Dictionary was made, what a Hardſhip ſtill muſt it be for one that would write ſuch true ſtandard *Latin*, to be obliged almoſt in every Sentence to have Recourſe to ſuch a Book. For among ſuch an Infinity of Words, it is ſimply impoſſible, as I ſaid, without it, to know certainly which have or have not been uſed before. This is ſuch a frightful Task, that few or none I think will willingly undergo it; but will rather chuſe to abandon a Language for ever, that is attended with ſuch inſupportable Labour and Drudgery.

§ 16. But to this it is anſwered by Mr. *Johnſon*, That if Analogy will be ſufficient for admitting of Supines without expreſs Authority for them; then it will equally hold in other Things, which yet are allowed by no Grammarians. "For if, ſays he, *ſuppetiarum* "*ſuppetiis* muſt not be uſed, becauſe not read, tho' *ſuppetiis* and "*ſuppetias* be both read; and nothing but *juſſu* muſt be uſed, be"cauſe nothing elſe of that Word is read: What Reaſon is there "to admit of the Uſe of *calitum*, *tacitum*, &c. which are neither "read themſelves, nor any one Caſe of them." But this is carrying the Argument beyond all Bounds: For he might as well infer that becauſe Analogy will not hold in every Thing, therefore it will hold in nothing, and that Authority alone muſt be the Rule of ſpeaking

eaking for every individual Word whatſoever; and by conſequence
t no Caſe of a Noun, or Perſon of a Verb muſt be uſed, till we
ſure that ſome other good Author has uſed it before us. What
dreadful Havock muſt this make upon the Language? And what
infinite Number of Words muſt at this Rate be laid aſide as bar-
rous, which hitherto all the World look'd upon as true and ge-
ine? But, as the Abſurdity of ſuch a Concluſion is obvious to any
e, ſo it can be no leſs evident, that there muſt be ſome Flaw or
er in the Application of the Premiſſes, from which it is drawn:
d this can be no other than his taking his *Medium* in an univerſal
d unlimited Senſe, which ought only to be taken in a reſtricted
d limited one.

§ 17. That I may therefore more directly ſhow the Fallacy of
. *Johnſon*'s Reaſoning, and put this Matter in a better Light at
ſt than I think he has done, I muſt premiſe, what, as I take it,
ways was, or ought to be the general Procedure of ſuch as would
e Directions for the attaining of any Language.

. They took their Meaſures from the common and ordinary Pra-
ce of thoſe who beſt ſpoke it; and this is what we call *Authority*
theſe Matters.

. Where they had no ſuch Authority (as there are innumerable
ſtances, eſpecially in dead Languages, where it cannot particular-
be had) they next had Recourſe to *Analogy*, or that *Reſemblance*
ich they obſerved ſuch or ſuch Ways of ſpeaking had to other
ys of ſpeaking of the like Kind, ſupported and authorized by the
ve Writers in that Language.

. But leaſt this Analogy, in a Thing of ſo arbitrary a Nature as
nguage is, if too generally followed, might miſlead them, they
refore thought it expedient, not to rely too much upon it,
to uſe it with great Caution and Circumſpection. In order
refore to keep a due *Medium*, between giving it too great Scope
the one Hand, and being too nicely ſcrupulous on the other,
en all direct Authority failed them, they did next caſt about to
what might reaſonably be gathered from the general Conſtituti-
of the Language, and the common Practice of its Authors; and
rticularly they applied themſelves to conſider, whether their O-
ſſion of a great many Words and Phraſes, otherwiſe not contra-
to the ordinary Analogy of the Language, proceeded from Chance
Deſign. If the former, they wiſely thought, that there was no
aſon for diſcharging the Uſe of ſuch Words or Phraſes: But if
latter, the very Thing itſelf gave them juſt Ground for diſchar-
g them.

§ 18. But then it will be asked, by what Means came they to
ow the one from the other? I own that in ſeveral Inſtances the
Matter

Matter was very difficult, but in innumerable others it was pre-
ty eaſy. For Example, when it was obſerved, that there were a
great many Words (here I take in all oblique Caſes, and other Va-
riations) which theſe Authors ſeldom or never had Occaſion to uſe,
it was not to be wondred that ſuch Words were not to be found in
them: Which however was no Reaſon, but that others, who ſhould
have Occaſion for ſuch Words, might not very lawfully and freely
uſe them. On the other Hand, when they obſerved a good many
Words of very frequent Uſe with theſe Authors in ſome particular
Parts or Variations of them, when other Parts or Variations of theſe
Words, naturally as fit to be made uſe of in Diſcourſe, were yet con-
ſtantly abſtained from; they very rationally inferred, that the Cu-
ſtom of the Language muſt be the only Bar againſt the Uſe of ſuch
Words. Thus, to give particular Inſtances, tho' perhaps they did
not find *parricidarum*, *infulas*, *ſemivirorum*, *avuncule*, *vanni*, *cor-
culo*, *generatori*, *certaminum*, *conclavibus*, *cruciatui*, *complexuum*,
ſtrepitibus, &c. yet they did not judge that *parricida*, *infula*, *semi-
vir*, &c. therefore wanted theſe Caſes. And in like Manner, tho'
they did not perhaps meet with *amatote*, *poſſediſſetis*, *obruerem*,
irretirentur, *includuntor*, &c. that therefore the Verbs *amo*, *poſſedeo*,
&c. were deſtitute of ſuch Perſons. But when they found theſe Au-
thors uſing always *Jupiter* in the Nominative, and in the other Caſes
Jovis, *Jovi*, *Jovem*, *Jove*, and not *Jupitris*, *Jupitri*, &c. they
concluded that the firſt of theſe in the common Uſe of the Language
wanted the oblique Caſes; and that the other wanted the Nomina-
tive. Thus likewiſe when they obſerved *vitis*, *vicem*, *vice*, *vices*,
and *vicibus*; and *preci*, *precem*, *prece*, *preces*, *precum*, and *precibus*;
and never *vix*, *vicum* or *vicium* [and probably *vici*] and never *prex*
or *precis*, tho' there was otherwiſe perhaps as frequent Occaſion for
the one as the other; they juſtly inferred that the Cuſtom of the
Language had aboliſhed theſe Caſes. The ſame may be ſaid of *dicis*,
juſſu, *promptu*, *noctu*, *inficias*, and *ſuppetiæ*, *ſuppetias*; *ſpontis*, *ſponte*;
ambage, *ambages*, *ambagibus*, &c. which being the only Parts
that are found of theſe Words; they reckoned that the other Parts
had gone into Deſuetude.

§ 19. The ſame Rule of judging they followed in Verbs, but
with this additional Conſideration, that the Parts of theſe being of
a far greater Number and Extent than thoſe of a Noun, (all the
Parts of a complete Verb, including Supines, Gerunds and Partici-
ples, being upwards of 113.) the Diſcovery of what Parts were in
Uſe, and what not, became thereby the more difficult. However
as it could never enter into their Heads, that no more Parts of a
Verb were to be uſed, than what they found preciſely in good Au-
thors, (that being a Thing very much accidental) the beſt Way they
could

uld think on for getting ſome Light in that Matter, was to conſi-
the principal Parts of a Verb, which commonly give Origin to
reſt. Now theſe being (in the Account of moſt Grammarians
ceeding Mr. *Johnſon*) the firſt Perſon of the Preſent of the In-
ative, the Preterite of it, and the firſt Supine; they laid down
s for a general Rule, that where the primary conſtituent Parts of
erb were to be found, tho' perhaps ſome of the Parts deſcend-
from them were not to be found; they judged that notwith-
ding they might in the main lawfully make uſe of theſe ſecon-
y Parts. Again, when they found ſome of the Deſcendents of
primary Parts, but did not find the primary Parts themſelves;
y thought that ſufficient for uſing, when there was Occaſion for
theſe primary ones. But when they could not meet with any of
heſe ſecondary Parts, which deſcend from one particular prima-
ne, nor that primary one itſelf; they concluded, with good Rea-
that it, with all its Deſcendents, were gone into Diſuſe. Thus,
pply what has been ſaid to our preſent Purpoſe, when they
d *ambulo*, *ambulavi* and *ambulatum*, they made no Doubt to
ambulabamus, *ambulaviſſent* and *ambulaturos*; tho' perhaps
did not hit upon theſe preciſe Words in Authors. Again, if
found *dedocet*, *concurreris*, and *præbiturus*, they thought they
ht ſafely uſe *dedoceo*, *concurri*, and *præbitum*. But when they
d not find *timitus* or *timiturus*, [or even *timitum*;] nor *ferie-*
, *-erim*, *-iſſem*, &c. [or yet *ferii*:] they concluded that *timeo*
ed the Supine, and *ferio* both Preterite and Supine, with all
reſpective Deſcendents.

20. It is indeed poſſible, that in ſome Inſtances this Rule may
But as theſe Inſtances muſt be, comparatively ſpeaking, but
and that even of theſe ſome perhaps may diſcover themſelves
other Way, to one much converſant in the Language, ſuch as
he Harſhneſs of the Sound, the Aukwardneſs of the Senſe, and
ke, that may appear in the Uſe of them; there can be little or
anger in following ſuch a Rule. I am ſure it is the beſt can be
ght on; and, if we will leave it, I know no other to take up
, unleſs we will have Recourſe to that univerſal *Latin* Dictiona-
mentioned; which as I never expect to ſee compoſed, ſo I be-
tho' it ſhould, few will have the Patience to make Uſe of.
ere, I have one Thing more to add, and which ought to have
derable Weight in this Matter, and that is, that theſe *old Gram-*
ans, who laid down this Rule, notwithſtanding the great Con-
t with which they are treated by ſome of the modern ones,
vaſt Advantage above them in this Reſpect, that they had the
ortunity of ſeeing and peruſing a great Number of theſe *Latin*
ors, which to us are now loſt, and conſequently could not miſs

to find in them a good deal of Supines, not to mention other Thing which to us, for that Reaſon, cannot otherwiſe be known but b the bare Analogy of the Language. What an unreaſonable Thing it then, that becauſe ſuch Supines, and other the like Words, do n occur in the few *Latin* Authors we have now remaining, we ſhou therefore think that either there never were ſuch Words, or, whic is much the ſame, that we ſhould in no Caſe be permitted to u them? I am afraid, that if we give Way to this Spirit of reformi the Language, it ſhall fare with us at laſt as it has done with ſo Reformers of Religion; and that inſtead of the old and true one, w ſhall frame to ourſelves a new Language that never was, or at le ſuch a conceited and whimſical one, as no wiſe Man will think worth while to ſpend his Time upon. I will not ſay that this is d rectly Mr. *Clarke*'s Intention: But I cannot help thinking that t ſuperſtitious Nicety, which he here and elſewhere ſhews in the U of the *Latin* Tongue, has a great Tendency that Way, of which w have a remarkable Proof in his *Diſſert. upon Language* mentioned bove, where, when he is arguing againſt the Fitneſs of *Latin*'s b ing the univerſal Language, from the great Difference that there betwixt our *Faſhions* and *Ways of Life*, and thoſe of the *old R mans*, he, *p.* 180. brings for an Inſtance the Word *Hora*, whic ſays he, *no more ſignifies what we mean by the* Engliſh *Word* Ho *than* Yard *and* Ell *ſignify the ſame Meaſure.* The Abſurdity of t is ſo palpable, that nothing can be more. For beſides that the Thi is falſe, the *Roman æquinoctial Hours*, or the *Hours* of the *Civil D* (which, as *Gellius* and others inform us, were reckoned from Mi night to Midnight) being preciſely the ſame with ours; he mig as well ſay that all Words that implied Meaſure or Quantity in a Language, ſhould be changed into new ones, as often as the Me ſure or Quantity ſignified by them was changed, and by conſequen that as the *Roman Denarius* became of leſs Weight in the Time the Emperors, than it had been under the Conſular Government, ſhould therefore have got a new Name for it: And that the Fren Word *Livre* ſhould as oft be changed into another Word, as t Value of it for ſome late Years has been changed. This is ſuch Whim as that of *Franc. Sanctius*, who in his *Minerva*, again and gain, *lib.* i. *cap.* 2. and *lib.* iii. *cap.* 2. and in his Additions *p.* 859, tells us, that *Ego amo Deum*, and *Deus amatur à me*, is *Latin*. But he has been ſufficiently confuted by one of the great and moſt judicious Criticks of his Age *James Perizonius*, in his N upon that Author: With whoſe Words in another Place, viz. iv. *cap.* 17. *n.* 7. I ſhall conclude this Subject: *Id tantummo* ſays he, *addemus, Modum, qui in omnibus rebus eſt optimus, — vandum; & cavendum, ne dum nimis moroſi ſimus in exigenda tinit*

itate, ſterilem in ea reddamus & ſtyli noſtri & linguæ ſermonem. n ita temere repudiaverim ego — locutiones, quas Analogia Syn- ceos & Significationis admittit, licet ejus exempla nunc non ita ſint bis in promptu: cum multa haud dubiè olim, etiam Ciceronis & uguſti tempore, Latinè dicta ſint, quorum tamen exempla & docu- nta in iis, qui ſuperſunt nobis ex illa ætate, Auctoribus deſideramus.

§ 21. Page 30. *lin. penult. Amaturum eſſe,* that he ſhould or ould love.] I ſhall not mention, that this Participle is often of e Nominative Caſe, as *Dicitur amaturus eſſe*, ſince he will ſay that rections are to be given us as to that in the Syntax. That which hiefly obſerve here, is that, 1*ſt*, His *Engliſh* is too looſe and vague Beginners; the proper and literal *Engliſh* of that future Tenſe of Infinitive being To be about to love. I own that that is ſcarce- an *Engliſh* Way of ſpeaking: But then, as I think that it is of eat Importance to young ones, to be taught what *Engliſh* Words *formally* and *preciſely* correſpond to the *Latin* ones, if they can made to underſtand it, as here they eaſily can, that Method ought be followed. 2*dly*, Mr. *Clarke* is not agreeable to himſelf: For the Preſent of this Mood, he gives us the literal *Engliſh*, *Amare* love, *&c.* but in the Preterperfect and Future he uſes a Circum- ution, *Amaviſſe*, That he loved or had loved, *Amaturum eſſe*, hat he ſhould, &c. Now, generally ſpeaking, wherever the eſent of the Infinitive has an Accuſative before it (which it would n by his Syntax, Rule x. it ſhould always have) the literal *Eng-* anſwering to it will ſound as aukwardly, as it does in the Pre- perfect or future Tenſes of that Mood. For it is fully as harſh l contrary to the *Engliſh* Idiom to tranſlate, *Dicit me amare*, He s me to love, as it is to tranſlate *Dicit me amaviſſe*, He ſays to have loved, and *Dicit me amaturum eſſe*, He ſays me to be out to love. Again, as, He leaves off to love, tho' literal, is od *Engliſh* for *Deſinit amare:* So I believe that, It had been bet- not to have loved, tho' literal, is good *Engliſh* for *Satius fuiſſet amaviſſe*. I therefore cannot help thinking that it is a much hter Way to ſet down the literal *Engliſh* for every Part of the rb, as *Lily* and ſeveral others have done, than in ſome Parts of it uſe Circumlocutions, in order to adapt it to the *Engliſh* Idiom; hich, in my Opinion, is better learned from Practice. 3*dly*, And hich confirms what I have already ſaid, this *Engliſh* Mr. *Clarke* ves for the Future of the Infinitive will only anſwer when the rb preceeding it is of the preterite Tenſe; as *Dicebat*, *dixit*, or *xerat ſe amaturum eſſe:* But will not anſwer when the preceeding rb is of the Preſent or Future Tenſe, as *Dicit ſe amaturum eſſe*, d *Dicet ſe amaturum eſſe*; for the *Engliſh* to theſe is, He ſays at he will love, and He will ſay that he will love. 4*thly*, Mr.

Clarke omits to add *vel fuiſſe*, which he no more ought to hav done, than to omit *vel fuiſſem*, after *amatus eſſem*, in the Preterpl perfect of the Subjunctive.

Page 31. *l.* 6. Mr. *Clarke* is very unaccurate in the Account o the *Gerunds*. For whereas he ſhould have told, that they are *kind of Subſtantive Nouns formed from Verbs, having in the* Singul *Number commonly five Caſes*, (which are all that he allows to an Noun,) *viz.* the *Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accuſative* an *Ablative*, he tells us only that they *are a Sort of Verbal Nouns*, with out acquainting us whether Subſtantive or Adjective, tho' by hi Rule of Syntax XXVII. one would be apt to think that he too them for Adjectives. Again, he gives them only three Caſes, th Genitive, Ablative and Accuſative (where by the By I obſerve, tha contrary to his own Order, he has put the Accuſative laſt, tha ſhould have been firſt, *vide* above, *p.* 61.) and has omitted the No minative and Dative. The latter of theſe Caſes, I own, is ſomewha rare, but not ſo rare as to make it a Grammatical *Punctilio*. Bu whatever is of that, it is far otherwiſe with the Gerund of the No minative: For tho' it is rarely uſed with an Accuſative after it, a *Petendum eſt pacem, Repudiandum eſt artes*; yet it is moſt common either when us'd abſolutely, as *Orandum eſt*, *Laborandum eſt*, &c or when it comes from a Verb that governs another Caſe than th Accuſative, as *Parcendum eſt teneris*, *Utendum eſt ætate*. To thes Omiſſions he has added another Fault, *viz.* in making the *Engliſh* o *Amandum*, to love; whereas *Amandum* ſignifies only Loving, an never to love, or to Loving, but when *ad* goes before it.

§ 23. *Page* 33. *l.* 14. He omits to mention *es*, for the ſecon Perſon Singular of the Imperative, as if there were no Authorit for it; whereas *Terence* has five times *Bono animo es*, *Eun.* I. 2. *Heaut.* iv. 6. 18. *Adelph.* ii. 4. 20. and 4. 5. 62. and *Phorm.* 7. 72. In like Manner, the ſame Author uſes the Compound *ade* as, *Dave*; *ades, reſiſte*, *And.* ii. 2. 7. and *Adeſdum*; *pauci te* lo, *And.* i. 2. 2. and *Ovid. Remed.* ℣. 704. *Phœbe ſaluber adu* And, not to mention others, *Virg. Ecl.* ii. 45. *Huc ades, ô formoſe puer* If he ſays, he omitted it, becauſe it was ſet down before in the Pre ſent of the Indicative: I anſwer, that he might as well have omi ted *legam* and *audiam* in the Preſent of the Subjunctive, becau the ſame Words are in the Future of the Indicative, their Signific tion in the one and the other Mood being no more different tha that of *es*. And this is the more faulty in Mr. *Clarke*, that he bring in here into the Imperative Mood, *ſis*, *ſit*, *ſimus*, *ſitis*, *ſint*, whic really belong to the Subjunctive, and have always the ſame form Signification. Nay here he overacts, by making *ſis* and *ſitis* of th

Mo

Mood, tho' he has not thought fit to make *ames* and *ametis*, *doceas* and *doceatis*, &c. of it, when the Reaſon was the ſame.

Page 34. *l.* 5. He renders *fuiſſe*, to have or had been, whereas he had rendred *amaviſſe*, not To have or had loved, but, That he loved, or had loved. This is not uniform.

Page 45. *l.* 3. He makes the Future of the Subjunctive Paſſive *amatus ero vel fuero*; in which he follows indeed the common Practice of moſt Grammarians: But I think it much better to omit *ero*, both as it ſeems incongruous to couple Words of different Moods; and alſo as it may miſlead Boys in the Syntax, where ſuch Words go before, as require that the Verbs ſhould be of the Subjunctive Mood; as, *Utinam ne priuſquam illò adveneris, pater tuus mortuus fuerit, Cave ne verba turpia loquutus fueris, Dummodo auxilia maturè miſſa fuerint*; where I much doubt if *erit*, *eris* and *erunt* would be good *Latin*.

§ 24. *Ibid. l.* 20. He makes the Future of the Infinitive Paſſive promiſcuouſly *amatum iri* and *amandum eſſe*. But there is generally, if not always, a great Difference betwixt theſe. For the ſecond does not ſo much import *Futurity* (which the firſt only does) as *Neceſſity*, *Duty* or *Merit*, as Mr. *Johnſon*, *Gram. Comment. p.* 394. but eſpecially *Ja. Perizonius in Sanct.* i. 15. 8. have ſhewn. Nay this laſt maintains, that the Future in *dus*, in the beſt Authors, is of the Preſent, not Future Tenſe.

Page 49. *l.* 14. He omits *Fi*, the ſecond Perſon Singular of the Imperative of *Fio*, tho' it is to be found not only in *Plautus*, but alſo *Horace*, Satyr. ii. 5. 38.

Page 52. *l.* 2. He omits *eſum iri*; and yet has *latum iri*, tho' Mr. *Johnſon* in his Liſt of Supines, has the firſt, and not the ſecond. But tho' Mr. *Clarke* is no Friend to the Supine, yet he might have allowed *edendum eſſe*, which is as good *Latin* as *ferendum eſſe*; tho' either of them, as I have juſt now obſerved, are properly Futures of the Infinitive.

Ibid. l. 4. He omits to tell, that *eo* and *queo* differ from the Paradigm of the fourth Conjugation, not only that they have *ibam* and *quibam*, and *ibo* and *quibo* (which Terminations are alſo to be found in good Authors from regular Verbs of that Conjugation) but alſo that they have *eunt*, *queunt*, *eam*, *queam*, *eunto*, *eundum*; and not *iunt*, *quiunt*, &c. Nay on the other Hand, ſome of the Compounds are regularly declined by good Authors, as *Tranſiet æ-ra*, for *tranſibit*, in *Tibull.* i. 4. 23. and *inietur ratio* for *inibitur* in *Sc. contra Rull.* ii. 25. *extr.* and *ambio* and *veneo* ſeem equally to allow either Way. See *Ruddimanni Gram. maj.* Tom. 1. p. 283. 91. and 92. But I ſhall let theſe Things paſs for *Trifles* to a Compendizer.

Ibid.

Ibid. l. 24. He takes away *foremus* and *foretis* from *forem.* I am not ſure whether theſe Words may be found or not: But I believe Analogy might as much bear us out in the Uſe of them, as of *malam, males, malet,* &c. which he allows; tho' there is as little Authority for theſe as for the other.'

Page 53. *l.* 1. He has *inquio* vel *inquam. Priſcian* indeed, and *Deſpauter* after him, vouch for *inquio* the Authority of *Cic. de Orat. lib.* ii. *cap.* 63. *Aucupari oportebit verba inquio,* &c. but (as *Alvarus* obſerves) *Priſcian* ſeems to have made uſe of a bad Copy, for all the beſt Editions read *in quo.*

Ibid. l. 8. It was idle to reckon *valebis, vale, valeto,* &c. among the defective Verbs: For that Verb is as complete as any neutral Verb, and the Signification every where the ſame. For, as *Cicero* frequently concludes his Epiſtles with *Vale,* ſo he often begins them with, *Si vales, bene eſt, ego valeo,* and *ſi vos valetis, nos valemus,* in the ſame Senſe.

Ibid. l. 11. He omits to tell that *odi* and *memini,* under the Termination of the Preterperfect Tenſe, have both the Signification of that Tenſe and of the Preſent.

§. 25. *Ibid. l.* 21. Rules, *&c.*] We have here a new Scene of Error and Diſorder opened to us. From this Page 53. to *p.* 63. he goes about to give Directions concerning the Formation of Verbs; the principal Parts whereof (beſides the *Thema,* or Preſent of the Indicative) are, according to him, the Preterperfect Tenſe in the Active Voice, and the Participle of that Tenſe in the Paſſive; which laſt he has ſubſtituted (contrary to the Practice of all former Grammarians) into the Place of the Supine. Tho' we have above ſufficiently expoſed the unreaſonableneſs of this Piece of Conduct, yet we ſhall here follow him in his own Method, and ſhew (which is no Recommendation to his new Scheme) that tho' the Road is of his own chuſing, yet he has oftner trip'd and blunder'd in it, than any Grammarian that I know of has done by treading in the old vulgar Path.

§ 26. I. To begin, as he does, with the *Preterperfect* Tenſe of *Verbs ſimple,* in the active Voice; his Method is firſt to ſet down general *Rules* through all the Conjugations; and then to ſubjoin all the *Exceptions* together in an *Alphabetical* Liſt by themſelves; by which he would have us underſtand (as it is juſt we ſhould) that whatever Verb is not contained in that Liſt of Exceptions, ought to be formed according to thoſe his general Rules. How exact he has been in this, is what we are now to examine in Order.

1. His Rule for the *Firſt Conjugation* is, that *o* is changed into *avi.* Now; (1.) As *ſono* is not in his Liſt of Exceptions, it ought to have *ſonavi,* tho' really it has *ſonui.* (2.) To *frico* in his Liſt he gives *fricavi*

ui or *fricui*, in which he has followed the otherwiſe deſpiſed *Lily*: but had he conſulted the moſt accurate Grammarian, not of his own only, but almoſt of any Country, Mr. *Johnſon*, he would have told him, *Gram. Comment. p.* 367, that the ſimple *frico* never has *fricavi*: Nay, tho' we find the Participles *refricaturus*, *defricatus*, *confricatus*, &c. yet we no where find *refricavi*, *defricavi*, *confricavi*. Vid. *Ruddim. Gram. maj. p.* 216. *n.* 42. (3) Contrary to this, he makes *neco* to have *necui* only; whereas there are only two Inſtances of *necui*, one from *Ennius*, and another from *Phædrus*, but a vaſt Number of *necavi* (which he hath omitted,) for which ſee *Johnſon*, p. 368 and 369.

2. In the *Second Conjugation*, (1) As *augeo auxi* is omitted out of his Liſt, it ought according to his general Rule to have *augui*. (2) *Ferveo*, *p.* 54. he makes to have *fervi*, and *p.* 56. *fervui*; but *fervi* is not from *ferveo*, but from *fervo* of the third Conjugation, which is uſed, not only by *Lucilius*, but alſo by *Terence*, *Virgil* and *Properius*. The true Preterite therefore of *ferveo* (which of old was *ferveo*) is *ferbui*. Vid. *Ruddim. p.* 221. *n.* 80. (3) According to him *connniveo* is to have only *connivi*: But there is as good Authority for *connixi* as for *connivi*; and this laſt ſeems rather to come from *connivo* of the third. *Vid. Priſcian*, *col.* 866. (4) In like Manner *cieo*, which he makes the Preterite of *cieo*, comes rather from *cio* of the fourth. *Vid. Ruddim. p.* 222. *n.* 85. (5) To *prandeo* he gives *pranſus ſum* only: Whereas the true Preterite of it is *prandi*: Nay ſome good Authors, and among theſe *Johnſon*, deny that *pranſus ſum* is the Preterite of that Verb.

3. In the *Third Conjugation*, (1.) *Vinco*, as being omitted out of his Exceptions, ought to have *vinci* inſtead of *vici*. (2) He places *credo*, *credidi*, and *dido*, *dididi*, among his Exceptions, which there was no Occaſion for, no more than for *vendo*, *vendidi*, *reddo*, *reddidi*; having told us, *p.* 62. *extr.* that the Compounds of *do* of this Conjugation (of which Number *credo* and *dido* are) have *didi* in their Preterite. (3.) He makes *capeſſo* and *faceſſo* to have *capeſſi*, *faceſſi*, as well as *capeſſivi* and *faceſſivi*: But *Urſin. To.* 1. *p.* 703, and after him *Ruddim. p.* 254. *n.* 67. have ſhew'd that there is no Authority for the former of theſe; and *Priſcian* himſelf inclines to that Opinion. (4) He omits *depſo*, *depſui*, for which there is good Authority, and none for *depſi*, which the Author of the *Nouvelle Methode*, and it would ſeem Mr. *Clarke*, gives to this Verb. (5) He omits from his Exceptions, *pergo*, *perrexi*, which therefore, according to his Rule for Verbs in *go*, ought to have *perxi*. (6) He omits to tell that *ambigo* and *vergo* want the Preterite. (7) He on the contrary mentions, that *ſatago* has *ſategi*, without any Neceſſity, ſince, according to his Rule for Compounds, it ſhould follow the

ſimple

ſimple *ago egi:* Beſides that *Voſſius* obſerves that *ſategi* is hardly to be found. (8.) He omits that *diligo* has *dilexi*, tho' he takes Notice that *intelligo* and *negligo* are ſo conjugated. (9.) He gives to *pango*, *panxi*, *pegi* and *pepegi:* But *Quintilian*, 1, 6. informs that *pepigi* (and I may add *pegi* too) is from the old Verb (which Mr. *Clarke* alſo Names) *pago*, not *pango*. (10.) He will not allow any Preterite to *frigo*, tho' all Grammarians that I know of give it *frixi*, and the Participle *frixus* ſeems to confirm it. (11.) He gives to *pecto*, *pexi* and *pexui*, to *necto*, *nexui* only, tho' there is as good Authority (if not better) for *nexi* as for *pexi*. (12.) He omits *allicio allexi*, *illicio illexi*. He may perhaps ſay, that it may be a Rule for them that he has told that *pellicio* has *pellexi:* but that will not do for *elicio elicui*, for which he ſays nothing. (13.) He makes *compeſco* to want the Preterite, tho' Examples of it are very common, *Ovid Sævos compeſcuit ignibus ignes*, and *Sitim compeſcuit undâ*. (14.) He omits *percello perculi*, unleſs he will ſay that it has *percellui*, for which there is no Authority, no more than for *perculſi*, which ſome give it. (15.) His Omiſſion of *ſallo ſalli*, may be excuſed, becauſe that Verb is very rarely uſed. (16.) Contrary to all Grammarians he makes *rudo* to have *ruſi*, (inſtead of *rudi:*) And that this is not a Typographical Error, appears from this, that as *Rudo* follows his general Rule for Verbs of that Termination, it ought not to have been put among his Exceptions at all. (17.) He makes *ſedi* the Preterite of *ſido*, whereas it has *ſidi*. V. Colum. xii. 24.

4. In the *Fourth Conjugation*, (1.) He ſays, for his general Rule, that *o* is changed into *ivi*, but that I ſuppoſe is an Error of the Preſs for *io*. (2.) He omits that *veneo* has *venii*, unleſs he will ſay that it is a *Syncope* for *venivi*. (3.) He omits *aperio*, *aperui*; and *operio*, *operui:* And the ſame may be almoſt ſaid of *reperio*, *reperi*; and *comperio*, *comperi*. For tho' theſe Verbs are ſaid to come from *pario peperi*; and tho' by his Rule, *p.* 62, the doubling of the firſt Syllable of the ſimple Verb is not retained in the Compound; yet as the Conjugation is changed, he ought to have taken Notice of theſe Verbs in his Exceptions. (4.) He gives to *cambio cambivi* and *campſi:* but there is no Authority for the firſt, and only that of the old Grammarian *Chariſius* for the ſecond. (5.) The ſame may be ſaid of *ſepio*, to which he gives *ſepivi* and *ſepſi:* tho' the firſt is vouched only by the vulgate Bible: The Example that is brought from *Livy* of *ſepiſſent* being, in the Opinion of *Gronovius*, a wrong Reading for *ſepſiſſent*.

5. Beſides theſe particular Errors and Omiſſions Mr. *Clarke* is guilty of in the Formation of the Preterites of Verbs, there are ſome Things that deſerve to be remarked of another Kind. Such as, (1.) That he makes two different Verbs of *accerſo* and *arceſſo*, tho' they

really but one and the ſame, *arceſſo* being always the true Read-
of the Verb, as *Voſſius* and others have demonſtrated. (2.) Tho'
would have every Thing that is uncommon to be baniſh'd from
ammar, eſpecially from a Compend ſuch as his is, yet he hath
e brought in ſeveral Verbs that are very uncommon, ſuch as,
ſi, *Batuo*, *bito*, *deſrugo*, *pollincio*, which laſt ſome think rather
uld be *pollingo*, from *lingo*. *Secondly*, Some Verbs that are not
be found at all, ſuch as *clavo*, *corriſco*, and *decanteſco*: But I
poſe that theſe are typographical Errors, for *calvo*, *coniſco*, and
auleſco, tho' the two laſt of theſe, as I am to obſerve by and by
very unuſual, and the firſt *Priſcian*, *p.* 883, reckons obſolete.
irdly, He muſters up among his Exceptions a great Number of
eptive Verbs, for what Reaſon I do not know. For, (1.) He has
erals that are very uncommon, as *Corneſco*, *corriſco*, or (as I
poſe) *coniſco*, *traſſeſco*, *decanteſco*, or (I ſuppoſe) *decauleſco*,
baleſco, *egeſco*, (for which there is ſcarce any Authority) *fermen-*
o, *flammeſco*, *fruticeſco*, *grandeſco*, *graviſco*, (rather *graveſco*) *he-*
ſco, *herbaſco*, *lapideſco*, *lenteſco*, *maſculeſco*, *plumeſco*, *quiniſco*,
eſco, *fereſco*, *ſolideſco*, *tenereſco*, *uveſco*. (2.) He omits more
are pretty common; as, *aceſco*, *adoleſco*, *albeſco*, *ardeſco*, *areſco*,
deſco, *caneſco*, *clareſco*, *ferveſco*, *flacceſco*, *floreſco*, *frondeſco*, *hor-*
o, *humeſco*, *langueſco*, *liqueſco*, *macreſco*, *madeſco*, *manſueſco*,
ereſco, *molleſco*, *nigreſco*, *noteſco*, *palleſco*, *paveſco*, *pigreſco*, *pu-*
ſco, *rareſco*, *roreſco*, *rubeſco*, *ſileſco*, *ſplendeſco*, *ſurdeſco*, *tabeſ-*
tepeſco, *torpeſco*, *tremiſco*, *tumeſco*, *vaneſco*. (3.) If he ſhall ſay
he omitted theſe becauſe Preterites are found from their Primi-
s, as *aceo*, *-ui*, *adoleo*, *-ui*, &c. I anſwer, *Firſt*, that that is not
of ſeverals of them, as *flacceo*, *molleo*, *pigreo*, *rareo*, *roreo*, nay,
theſe, few are found at all. *Secondly*, Of theſe he hath mention-
there are ſome from whoſe Primitives Preterites are found, at
the Primitives themſelves; as, *adveſperaſco*, *adveſperaviſſet*, *ca-*
o, *talui*; *dureſco*, *induruit*; *grandeſco*, *ingranduit*; *marceſco*, *e-*
rcuit; *pubeſco*, *pubui*; *ſordeo*, *inſorduit*; *ſurdeo*, *obſurduerunt*;
geſco, *turſi*: As alſo *ægreo*, *hebeo*, *labo*, *muceo*. *Thirdly*, Some
expreſly mentions, as *caleſco*, *talui*; *calveo* and *calveſco*, *dulceo*
dulceſco; *dureſco*, *durui*; *egeſco* (for which there is little Au-
rity) *egui*; *flaveo* and *flaveſco*, *hebeo* and *hebeſco*, *liveo* and *li-*
ſco; and theſe Primitives alone, *caneo*, *canui*; *ferveo*, *fervui*; *hu-*
o, *paveo*, *vireo*. (4.) Since he has thought fit to take into his
thoſe unuſual *Inceptive* Verbs above named, why did he leave
others of that Kind, which tho' unuſual are not more ſo than
ſe? as *Arboreſco*, *laſſeſco*, *ſicceſco*, *ſterileſco*, *ſilveſco*, *ſtirpeſco*, *ve-*
eſco, mentioned by *Johnſon* in his *Addit.* to *Gram. Comment.*
57. As alſo, *Amareſco*, *crebeſco* or *crebreſco*, *crudeſco*, *fraceſco*,

hilareſco, luteſco, puellaſco, radiceſco, rutileſco, ſpiſſeſco, ſpumeſco, tardeſco, tenereſco, valeſco, veteraſco. From what I have obſerved concerning theſe *Inceptive* Verbs, it will appear evident to any one that Mr. *Clarke* has pickt them up at Random, without any Rime or Reaſon at all.

§ 27. II. I proceed next to his Rules for forming the *Participles of the Preterperfect Tenſe*; where continuing his former Method of giving us firſt his general Rules of the Formation of them (after his own peculiar Way) from the *Preterperfect* Tenſe of the Active, he next ſubjoyns his *Exceptions* in *Alphabetical* Order. And in this he acquits himſelf with no better Succeſs than he does in the Formation of that Preterperfect Tenſe Active: As will appear by what follows.

His Rules are, That

Ci, gi, qui, xi, are changed into *ctus.*
Di, li, ri, ſi, ti, into *ſus.*
Mi, ni, pi, change *i* into *tus.*
Pſi is changed into *tus.*
Vi into *tus.*
Ui into *itus.*

Now as there are a great many Participles, which are neither to be found in his Alphabetical Liſt, nor yet anſwer to his Rules, the Omiſſion of them muſt naturally lead ſuch as are to truſt to him into ſo many Blunders; as will appear when we ſhew firſt what the Participles really are, and next what they ſhould be according to him.

(1.) You have here theſe Participles, with the Verbs they belong to, as they really are, *viz. Acuor, acutus, abluor, ablutus,* [ſo *alluor, diluor,* &c.] *agnoſcor, agnitus; aperior, apertus; arguor, argutus; cenſeor, cenſus; caveor, cautus; cognoſcor, cognitus; faveor, fautus,* (whence *fautor*) *imbuor, imbutus; induor, indutus;* (ſo *exuor, exutus*) *linquor, lictus;* at leaſt *relinquor, relictus; metor, meſſus; occulor, occultus; operior, opertus; ruo, rutus* or *ruitus,* (whence *ruiturus;*) *ſtatuor, ſtatutus; ſtringor, ſtrictus; ſiſtor, ſtatus; ſuor, ſutus; tribuor, tributus; texor, textus.* But according to Mr, *Clarke's* preceeding *Rules* (ſince he has nothing about them in his *Exceptions*) we have a new Sort of Participles for theſe Verbs never before heard of, *viz. Acuor, acitus; abluor, ablitus; aperior, aperitus; agnoſcor, agnotus; arguor, argitus; cenſeor, cenſitus; caveor, catus; cognoſcor, cognotus; faveor, fatus; imbuor, imbitus; linquor, lictus; metor, meſſitus; occulor, occulitus; operior, operitus; ruor, rutus; ſtatuor, ſtatitus; ſtringor, ſtrinctus; ſiſtor, ſtiſus; ſuor, ſitus; tribuor, tribitus; texor, texitus.*

(2.) The

(2.) Tho' he tells us, *p.* 62. that the doubling of Letters in the eterperfect Tenſe of a ſimple Verb is not retained in that Tenſe the Compound; yet as there are only a few Verbs, *dor, datus*; *llor, falſus*; *pangor, pactus*; *pellor, pulſus*, in which he tells us at that Doubling of Letters is not retained in the Participles of mple Verbs; it muſt conſequently follow, that where ſuch Verbs e not mentioned, they ought (according to his Rules) to have the ginning of their Participles doubled as well as their Preterites: nd ſo inſtead of giving to *mordeor, ſpondeor, pendeor, tondeor, rſus, ſponſus, penſus, tonſus*; and to *parior, partus*; *parcor, par-*; *tundor, tunſus*; *cador, caſus*; *cædor, cæſus*; *tendor, tenſus* or *tus*; *pendor, penſus*; and to *tangor, tactus*; *pungor, punctus*; *ca-r, cantum eſt*; *curritur, curſum eſt*; we muſt give them theſe Par-ciples hitherto unknown, *momorſus, ſpoponſus, pepenſus, totonſus, peſus, peperctus, tutuſus, ceciſus, cecîſus, tetenſus, pepenſus, tetictus, puctus, cecintum eſt, cucurſum eſt.*

(3.) Where he is guilty of an Error or Omiſſion in the Preterite, of which I have given too many Inſtances) 'tis a great Chance if is right in his Participle, which according to him depends upon . I ſhall only inſtance in two Verbs (for it would be tedious to through all) *augeo* and *frigo*. The firſt of theſe, not having its eterite *auxi* mentioned in his Liſt of Exceptions, ought therefore, cording to his general Rules for Verbs of the ſecond Conjugation, have *augui*; and as *augeor* is as little mentioned among his Excep-ns of Preterites, it ought conſequently by his Rules for theſe to ve *augitus*. Again, as he makes *frigo* to have no Preterite, ſo by Rules it ought to have no Participle, whereas it has *frixi* for the mer, and *frixus* or *frictus* for the latter.

(4) There are other particular Verbs (beſides thoſe already na-d) in which the Learner, if he has no better Guide than Mr. arke, muſt go wrong. As (1.) *Potor* according to him, muſt ve only *potatus*, whereas it has as often, if not oftner, *potus*, and rdly ever otherwiſe in its Compounds, as *appotus, epotus*. (2.) gives to *lavor, lautus* and *lavatus*, omitting *lotus*, which (as a rticiple) is more common than either of theſe, and ſo almoſt al-ys *elotus* and *illotus*. And if he ſhall ſay, that *lotus* comes from (which by the By is not true) it will not mend the Matter, for n the Participle according to him muſt be *litus*. (3.) As he es to *neco* only *necui*, its Participle ſhould be *necitus*; but it be-obſerved before, that it has much oftner *necavi* than *necui*, ſo has generally *necatus*, ſcarce *nectus* (unleſs in the Compound *ene-s,*) never *necitus*. (4.) As he has no Rule for Preterites in *bi*, ſo cannot be known what Participle *bibor* or its Compounds have, o' *Pliny* has *bibitus*. (5) As he gives to *ſero, ſerui*, and to *ſeror*

ſatus only, he doubly miſleads his Readers, *firſt*, that he omits to tell that *ſero* has two Preterites, tho' generally in a different Sense *ſevi* as well as *ſerui*; and *2dly*, that it has likewiſe two Participles *ſertus* as well as *ſatus*: Which is yet more remarkable in its Compounds (of which he takes ſmall Notice) *conſero*, *conſerui*, *conſertus*, and *conſero*, *conſevi*, *conſitus*, &c. 'Tis true he takes notice of one of theſe Compounds, *aſſeror aſſertus*: But that will give but ſmall Direction for the reſt, and none for its having alſo *aſſitus*. (6.) He has *pecto pexus*, and *necto nexus*, but nothing of *flecto flexus*, or *plecto*, *plexus*; which therefore, as, according to him, *flecto* has *flexi*, and *plecto plexi*, ſhould have likewiſe according to him *flectus* and *plectus*.

(5.) Of theſe that want the Preterites, he takes only notice of eight, *viz.* *medeor*, *metuor*, *poſcor*, *reſellor*, *ſentior*, *timeor*, *veſor* and *urgeor*. I ſhall not inſiſt, that from *metuor* *Lucretius* uſes *metutus*, and from *ſentior* comes *ſenſa animi* and *ſenſurus*: Becauſe the firſt is ſcarcely to be imitated, and the ſecond may be ſaid to be uſed as a Subſtantive. That which is more to be taken notice of is, that he hath omitted more than he has ſet down; as, *Arceor*, *fleor*, *lambor*, *diſcor*, *angor*, *liquor*, *ringor*, and theſe Compounds *reticeor*, *reſpuor*, *attollor*, *reminiſcor*, *prævertor*, *diffiteor*, *defetiſcor*, &c.

(6.) I obſerve, that of thoſe he mentions, (1.) *Citus* is not from *cieor*, but from *cior*. (2.) That *iratus* is not a Participle from *irascor*, but a Noun. *Vid. Urſin. To.* 1. *p.* 763. no more than *defeſſus* from *defetiſcor*. (3.) That *menſus* and not *meſſus*, is the Participle from *metior*. (4.) That *orditus* from *ordior*, is not to be imitated. *Vid. Voſſ. de vit. ſerm.* i. 24. (5.) That *pandor* has *panſus* as well as *paſſus*, at leaſt in its Compounds. (6.) That there was no Reaſon for his putting *ſinor ſitus* among his Exceptions, more than *sino litus*; ſince both follow his general Rule. (7.) He omits the ordinary Rule for the Participles of deponent Verbs, namely, that they are formed by Analogy, in ſuppoſing them to have had an Active as *miror* has *miratus*, becauſe if we could ſay *miro*, its Preterite would be *miravi*, &c. Inſtead of that, it would ſeem, he gives us Examples of the Participles of ſuch Verbs in the three firſt Conjugations, *meditor*, *meditatus*; *vereor*, *veritus*; and *fungor*, *functus*. But as he gives not the leaſt Hint of what he deſign'd by mentioning theſe, the Learner will be at a Loſs what Participles to give the reſt, as *adulor*, *moror*, *precor*, *teſtor*, &c. *amplector*, *complector*, and *blandior*, *largior*, *molior*, *mentior*, *potior*, *ſortior*, &c. for which laſt Kind of the 4th Conjugation, he has given no Example, unleſs he will have *opperitus* and *orditus* to paſs for ſuch: But the latter, I ſaid, is not to be imitated, and I believe as little the former.

les, as he has given to both these other and truer Participles, *op-rtus* and *orsus*, the bare mention of them can never be a Directi- for other Verbs of that Conjugation; unless it be, that they in e Manner should have two Participles, which it would be absurd imagine. As to *mereor*, *meritus*, he might have spar'd the menti- of it, since it has also actively *mereo*, *merui*.

(7.) I might here lastly observe, That tho' neutral or intransitive erbs generally have no passive Voice, yet when used impersonally, great many have the third Person singular of that Voice. Now, the Preterites of these are made by the Participle in *um* of the euter Gender, as *erratum est*, *clamatum est*, *equitatum est*, *pecca-m est*, &c. *dolitum est*, *mansum est*, *placitum est*, *sessum est*, &c. *rsum est*, *fremitum est*, *parsum est*, *reptum est*, *surrectum est*, &c. *rmitum est*, *garritum est*, *itum est*, *ventum est*, &c. Mr. *Clarke* ould have given some Directions concerning them, especially such them as will not answer to his Rules, as *indulgetur*, *indultum est*; *gitur*, *fugitum est*; *pergitur*, *perrectum est*. He mentions indeed, 50. *Impersonal* Verbs of the active Voice, as *pœnitet*, *tædet*, *pu-t*, *piget*: And *p.* 59, he tells us, "That intransitive or neuter Verbs, form no passive Voice, except that they are used some-times in the third Person singular, as *vivitur*, i. e. *ab hominibus*, Men live." He means certainly, that they are used imperson-; and that is equally true of transitive Verbs, as *amatur*, *legitur*, c. But he says nothing of their Preterite Tense, *victum est*, *ama-m est*, &c. and as little that *licet* has *licuit* and *licitum est*; *libet*, *uit* and *libitum est*, *miseret*, *misertum est*, rather than *miseruit*, *get*, *piguit* and *pigitum est*; *pudet*, *puduit* and *puditum est*. But he ill say that these Things are nothing else but Grammatical *Niceties*, d only fit to be known to those that design to make themselves mpleat Masters and Criticks in the Language; tho' few, I sup-ose, will be of his Opinion.

§ 28. III. We are now come in the last Place to Mr. *Clarke*'s ules for the *Preterites* and *Participles* of *compound Verbs*: And as e have given so many Instances of his Errors and Omissions with spect to those of *simple* Verbs; it is not to be expected that he will quit himself better in those of compound Verbs, which generally w from and depend upon them. It were tedious, as well as un-ecessary, to trace him through every Particular: It will therefore ffice to touch at these Things that are most remarkable, and to ave the rest to be gathered from what is said above. But in order do this, we must first take Notice of what he has said upon this ead: And that is all comprehended under a general Rule, at *Compounds* are formed as their *Simples*; to which he subjoins e Exceptions, one concerning Verbs, whose Simples double the

Be-

Beginning of their Preterite; another concerning the Compounds of *plico*, and a third concerning thoſe of *oleo*. Theſe being all the Directions he has thought fit to give in this Matter, I obſerve.

(1.) That the following Compounds are omitted, (1.) *Dimico*, which has much oftner *dimicavi* than *dimicui*. (2.) That *contundo* and the other Compounds of *tundo*, have *tuſus* not *tunſus*. (3.) That the Compounds of *pungo* have *punxi*, and not *pupugi*, (except *repungo* which hath both;) and from this it is, that in their Participles they have *punctus*. (4.) The Compounds of *cano*, have *cinui*, not *cini*. (5.) The Compounds of *ſalio* have *ſultum*, and not *ſaltum* or *ſiltum*, as *aſſultum eſt*, *reſultum eſt*, whence *reſulto*. (6.) That *aperio* and *operio*, have *perui* not *peri* in their Preterite, as they ſhould by his firſt Exception.

(2.) That many Compounds that change *a* of the ſimple into *i* have *e* in the penult Syllable of the Participle, as *capio*, *cepi*, *captus*; *jacio*, *jeci*, *jactus*; *incipio*, *incepi*, *inceptus*; *injicio*, *injeci*, *injectus*; not *incaptus*, or *injactus*. 'Tis likely he will ſay that the Letter *e* is retain'd, becauſe it is in the Preterite: But as he makes the Participles of the Simples, and not the Preterites either of the Simples or Compounds, to be the Rule for the Participles of Compounds, theſe Verbs having *a* in the former, ought likewiſe, according to him, to have it in the latter: And this is what has really happened to *dego*, *infringo*, *compingo*, and ſuch like Compounds, which notwithſtanding that both they and their Simples have *e* in their Preterites, yet in Imitation of their Simples, *actus*, *fractus*, *pactus*, retain *a* in their Participles, *adactus*, *infractus*, *compactus*. But what will he ſay to *occido*, *contingo*, *diripio*, *concino*, *inſilio*, and ſuch like Compounds, which in their Preterites have *i*, and yet ſome have *a*, ſome *e*, and ſome *u* in their Participles; *occaſus*, *contactus*; *direptus*, *concentus*, *inſultus*? And if it ſhall be ſaid, that there are no ſuch Participles as *occaſus*, *concentus*, and *inſultus*; yet we have Words that according to him are analogically form'd from them, *occaſurus*, *concentus*, *ûs*, and *inſulto*; and which he is as much obliged to account for as I am.

I have now gone through all that Mr. *Clarke* has ſaid of the Preterites and the Participles of Verbs; and have diſcovered ſo many Errors and Omiſſions in this Part of his Performance, as may juſtly make any Grammarian aſhamed to have treated it after ſuch a Manner. It will be but a ſorry Apology for him, to tell us, as he does in his Preface, *p.* iv. "That had it not been for Fear of giving Offence to weak Readers, he was once minded to omit ſaying any "Thing concerning that Part which relates to the Preterperfect "Tenſe of Verbs." The Effect of this indeed has been, as commonly happens, that when a Man's Heart does not go along with the

ork he is upon, he generally performs it in a trifling & perfuncto-
us Manner; which is so remarkable in the Instance now before
, that Mr. *Clarke* is so far from giving Satisfaction, either to *weak*
strong Readers, that I dare answer for them, they would have
en better pleased if he had stood to his first Resolution, and not
ve meddled with that Matter at all.

I come now to Mr. *Clarke*'s *Latin Syntax*, which, tho' it is that
rt of his Grammar which he has thought worthy of his chiefest
re, and most highly values himself upon, yet, in my Opinion, is
ny Ways faulty and insufficient, as I shall shew in the following
rticulars.

§ 30. I. *It is very defective.* For, not to mention a great many
ings of lesser Note, there are several *Rules* of *Syntax*, the Use
hereof cannot but frequently occur, both in the reading of Au-
rs, and in the Practice of translating into *Latin*; which I do
find in him. Such as, 1. The Agreement of two *Substantives be-
ging to the same Thing* in Case. 2. That when the last of two
bstantives relating to different Things has an Adjective of *Praise*
Dispraise, &c. join'd with it, both it and its Adjective may, and
h Orators most frequently are, put in the Ablative; as *Vir ingenio
ci.* 3. That *Est*, when used for *habeo*, governs a Dative; as *Est
bi injusta noverca.* 4. That *Sum*, with several other Verbs, as *forem*,
duco, *habeo*, *tribuo*, *relinquo*, *verto*, govern two Datives, the
e of the Person, the other of the Thing; as *Sunt hæ tibi nu-
cordi.* 5. That *celo*, and Verbs of *Teaching* and *Asking*, go-
n two Accusatives, the one of the Person, the other of the Thing.
t is said, That this is nothing else but the Government of active
nsitive Verbs repeated, and that in *Doceo te Grammaticam*, *Rogo
ceptorem veniam*, the Construction is to be taken separately, for
ceo te, and *Doceo Grammaticam*; *Rogo præceptorem*, and *Rogo ve-
m* (which yet in *celo*, and some other Instances, will not well
d;) what will he say of his next Omission, and which in a great
asure destroys this Pretence? 6. That the Passives of these Verbs
in the last Accusative, as *Puer docetur Grammaticam*, *Is primus
atus est sententiam.* 7. That *Participles*, *Gerunds* and *Supines* go-
n the same Cases that the Verbs they come from do govern. 'Tis
e, by Way of *Note* subjoined to his xx Rule, p. 87. where one
uld not readily have expected it, he gives a Hint concerning the
rticiple (but nothing of the *Gerund* or *Supine*) in a *Parenthesis*,
s, *The Agent after a passive Verb or Participle* (*for the Govern-
nt of Verbs and their Participles are the same*) *is frequently the
sive in the Poets*, &c. But what a superficial Way of treating
Matter is this? 8. That he passes over the Construction of these
r Prepositions, *In*, *sub*, *super* and *subter*, with placing *in* among

the

the Prepoſitions that govern the Ablative, and then adding this Note, "[* *Clam*, *in* ſignifying Motion, *ſub*, *ſuper* and *ſubter* govern "likewiſe an Accuſative:]" which is a Note, in my Opinion, good for nothing. For *Ambulo* or *curro in campo*, and *campum*, equally ſignify Motion; but the Signification is otherwiſe very different. And the ſame holds generally true of *ſub* and *ſuper*, tho' with Reſpect to theſe laſt (according to him) the Ablative or Accuſative may be uſed promiſcuouſly whether Motion or Reſt is ſignified. But perhaps he means that the Motion is in the Prepoſition *in*, and not in the Verb going before it: But I much doubt if Boys will understand it. He had much better, after his *Engliſh* Way of doing Buſineſs, have told them, that the *Latin* Prepoſition *in*, when it may be rendred into, governs the Accuſative; when ſimply in the Ablative. 9. That Verbs compounded with Prepoſitions often govern a Noun in that Caſe which the Prepoſitions affecting them do govern; as *Inire prælium*, *Exire prælio*. 10. That the Conſtruction he gives us of the other *Indeclinable* Parts of Speech (which he has thought fit to put in the Etymological Part of his *Grammar* p. 63 and 64) is not only very lame and ſuperficial, but alſo ſometimes erroneous. Of the firſt Kind are, that he omits to tell us (1.) That *En* and *ecce* are conſtrued either with the Nominative or Accuſative; *Hem* for *ecce*, with the Accuſative. (2.) That *derivative Adverbs* govern the Caſe of their *Primitives*. (3.) That *ne* the Adverb of forbidding is join'd with the Imperative or Subjunctive but *non*, in that Senſe, only with the Future of the Indicative; which *Quintilian* has thought fit to take Notice of in his *Inſtit. Orat.* I. (4.) That *utinam*, and *ne* for leſt, are joined with the Subjunctive only. (5.) That *quin* for *ut non*, or *quo minus*, is likewiſe only conſtrued with that Mood. Of the ſecond Kind are, (1.) That he tells us that the Conjunctions *licet* and *ut* may indifferently have an Indicative or Subjunctive join'd with them. Of the laſt I know no Example with the Indicative; nor yet of the former, but among the *media & cadentis Latinitatis auctores*, as *Sanctius*, *Perizonius* and others obſerve. (2.) That *dum* for *donec* is only join'd with the Subjunctive. What will he ſay then for that of *Cicero*, Attic. x. 3. *go in Arcano opperiar*, *dum hæc cognoſco*; and theſe of *Terence*, Eu. I. 2. 126. *Exſpectabo dum venit*; and *Heaut.* iv. 3, 39. *Unus dies*, *dum argentum eripio*. If he had ſaid *dum* for *dummodo* (which by the by is another Omiſſion of his) he had ſaid right. And here I cannot but obſerve ſomething very like a Contradiction in him: for above in Page 64, he places *donec* for *quouſque* among the *Conjunctions* (I would rather call it an *Adverb*) that indifferently may have either the Indicative or Subjunctive; and yet it is only in the Senſe of the Word *donec* (or *uſquedum*, as it had been better

pre

reſt) that *dum*, being uſed for it, requires the Subjunctive; tho' not always, as I have juſt now ſhew'd. And, if by *quouſque* he means *quamdiu*, both *donec* itſelf, and *dum* taken in that Senſe, are, for ought I know, always joined with the Indicative; as, Cic. Att. x. 12. *Ægroto, dum anima eſt, ſpes eſſe dicitur*, and Ovid. Triſt. i. 5. *Donec eris felix, multos numerabis amicos.* (3.) That he tells us that *heu* and *prô* govern only the Nominative; whereas they are very frequently joined with the Accuſative; and ſometimes with the Vocative, if we dare call that a Caſe. But to leave theſe Things, which with him will paſs for *little Niceties* and *inſignificant Punctilio's*, I ſhall only name two more Defects in his Syntax, which I take to be pretty conſiderable, *viz.* 11. That all interrogative Words (which are very numerous) when they become indefinite, or loſe the direct Force of an Interrogation, require the Subjunctive Mood; as *Ubi eſt frater tuus? Neſcio ubi ſit.* And, 12. That he takes no Notice of the Figures either Etymological or Syntactical. Mr. *Trotter* has but ſlightly touched the ſyntactical ones, being perhaps frighted at the ſonorous Names of ſome of them, as he tells us he is at thoſe of the tetraſyllable Feet [ſee his Grammar, *p.* 104.) and Mr. *Clarke* is ſo diſguſted with them, that he has no where (ſo far as I know) ever mentioned one of them: And as for the *Metaphors*, *Metonymies*, *Catachreſes*, *Hyperbole's*, *Proſopopees*, and any ſuch ſuch like *Tropes* and *Figures* uſed by Rhetoricians, he would have the whole Train of them to be baniſhed, not only from Schools, but (as it would ſeem) alſo from Language. [See above, p. 55.] But whatever Mr. *Trotter*, who very ſuperficially touches them, and Mr. *Clarke*, who altogether deſpiſes them, may think, it is certain that all Languages, eſpecially the learned ones, are full of them; and particularly that there is no underſtanding the old Latin Authors (with whom only I am at preſent concerned) without a tolerable Knowledge of them. Or, if the *Names* of them are *parrenda memoratu*, to Boys; at leaſt I think it will be neceſſary to make them in ſome Meaſure acquainted with the Things ſignified by them. Otherwiſe they will be much puzzled, when they meet with *alituum* for *alitum*, *dicier* for *dici*, *Deûm* for *Deorum*, *ſciſti* for *ſciviſti*, and the like; and yet more, when they find *Vir præſtans animi*, *Capita conjurationis virgis cæſi*, *Fac me ut ſciam*, *Non licet mihi eſſe otioſo*, *Brachium gladio percuſſus*, and innumerable ſuch like, not only in Poets, but Proſe-writers: Of all which Mr. *Clarke* however takes not the leaſt Notice.

§ 31. Now, what muſt be done with all theſe, and the many other Things mentioned above? Why, they are with him mere *Trifles*, and *impertinent Stuff*, and quite *foreign* to the Purpoſe of Grammar, as he has told us in his, *Præf.* Page xi. and in Page x. that

they are *of little or no Significancy to the writing or ſpeaking* Latin. Pray after what Manner would Mr. *Clarke* have a Language to be written or ſpoke, if not after the Manner of the People that uſed it? And if the *Latin* Authors are all full fraught with ſuch Ways of ſpeaking as I have before repreſented, how is it poſſible, without knowing theſe, I ſhall not ſay to imitate, but even in any tolerable Degree to underſtand them. Yes, ſays he, there is another Way of doing it, than by a *Grammar*; and becauſe this Way of his is very ſingular, I ſhall ſet down the whole Paſſage, as we have it in the Preface to ſome of the latter Editions of his *Introduction to the making of* Latin, P. xi. "I have (ſays he) in the 6th and 7th Editions "added Rules for the Gender of Nouns, which, with the Rules of "*Syntax* laid down in this *Introduction*, together with the Declen- "ſion of Nouns, and Formation of Verbs, is, I think, all the *Gram-* "*mar* neceſſary for Boys, till they are able to read the *Latin* Hi- "ſtorians commonly uſed in the Schools *well*, and have made "ſome Progreſs in the Poets; and then all perhaps that is further "neceſſary in the Way of *Grammar*, is, to obſerve to them Things "that are *uncommon*, as they happen to riſe in their Leſſons, and "theſe Things may have a Mark ſet over againſt them in the Mar- "gin of their Books, that by frequent Reviews of them the Boys may "fix them in their Memories. By virtue therefore (continues he) "of this Addition, this *Introduction* is made as complete a *Gram-* "*mar* as Boys acquainted with their Nouns and Verbs will have a- "ny great Occaſion for at School; and if it is ſubſtituted in the "Room of *Lily's Grammar*, will ſave them two Years Time at the "leaſt, *&c.*"

I know not what Wonders one of Mr. *Clarke*'s peculiar Dexteri- ty may work with Boys; but I am almoſt perſuaded, that with or- dinary Maſters, if none of thoſe *uncommon* Things (as he calls ev- ry Thing he has omitted, tho' many of them are very *common*) are to be taken Notice of to Boys, till they are able (not to mention the Poets) to read theſe *Latin Hiſtorians* WELL, (*i. e.* as I con- ceive it, till they underſtand not only their Senſe, but the Ways of ſpeaking uſed by them;) they ſhall never during that Time read them *well* at all. As to the *Setting of a Mark* (which yet he would not have done, till they can read theſe Authors WELL) *over against* theſe *uncommon* Things *in the Margin of their Book*, if it is to be a bare *Mark*, ſignifying in general that ſome *uncommon* Thing occurs in ſuch a Place, I am afraid that among ſo great a Number of them as will thus caſt up, a Boy will not be able to diſtinguiſh them from one another. But if he is to ſet them down at Length, I doubt if the Margin of his Book (as theſe School Authors are commonly print- ed) will contain them; not to ſpeak of the blubbering and bung- ling

ng Work he will generally make of it in ſo doing. And what is he Uſe of all this? Why, that *by frequent Reviews* of what the Boy erhaps can now hardly read, *he may fix them in his Memory.* I m glad that he will have theſe *uncommon Things*, as they are ſcrib-led on the Margin of the Boy's Book, to be *frequently review'd* nd *fixt in his Memory*: If ſo, what, in the Name of Goodneſs, nakes them *impertinent Stuff*, and *foreign to the Purpoſe*, when put n a *Grammar*, where they can be more regularly and exactly deli-ered, and more eaſily remembred than poſſibly they can be, after hat other Method, which one would be tempted to think Mr. *Clarke* has made Choice of, purely for the Oddneſs and Singularity f it? But I proceed to another Fault in his Syntax, which is what ne would not readily have expected, namely,

§ 32. II. *In ſome Things it is ſuperfluous:* As 1. His vth Rule, iz. *When an Infinitive Mood or a Sentence is the Subject of a Verb, r put inſtead of a Subſtantive to an Adjective, the Verb is the third erſon ſingular, and the Adjective the neuter Gender*, in a Compend ke his might have been ſpared, or at moſt been made a *Note* to is firſt Rule, in much fewer Words, *viz.* That *the Infinitive Mood r ſome Sentence frequently ſupplies the Place of the Nominative.* 2. is xiith Rule, *viz.* Of *put for* about *or* concerning *is made by* de, or from *by* a, ab *or* de, *for* out of *by* e *or* ex, either ſhould have een left out of a Compend; or he ought to have taken Notice how iis and other Particles, as to, for, in, with, *&c.* as oft as they ccur in *Engliſh*, are to be made *Latin*; otherwiſe this Rule will eceive the Learner in many Inſtances; as in theſe, He accuſes me f Theft, I am aſhamed of my Brother, Beware of Intem-erance, and the like. And, tho' in other Parts of his Syntax Mr. *Clarke* gives Rules for ſome of theſe, yet Boys will be apt to follow he general one given here. But of this and ſuch like Rules I will ave Occaſion to take Notice under another Head. 3. His xxviiith ule, and I may ſay the ſame of all the ſix following, as he has ma-aged them, are all ſuperfluous, as not being ſtrictly Rules of *Syn-ax*, but of *Phraſeology*, or Directions how the ſame Sentence may e differently varied; which belongs more properly to *Oratory* than *Grammar*, as ſhall be ſhew'd afterwards.

§ 33. III. *It is in ſome Places very obſcure.* As 1. Rule Vth men-oned above, *When an Infinitive Mood*, &c. 2. Rule Xth, *When a entence*, &c. as ſet down afterwards. 3. Rule XXVIIIth, *A Par-iciple of the preſent Tenſe Tranſitive, applied to the Subject of a Verb ranſitive, and having the ſame Object, may be rendred into* Latin *y the Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe, agreeing with the common bject in the Accuſative.* 4. Rule XXIXth, *A Participle of the pre-nt Tenſe Tranſitive, applied to the Subject of a Verb, that is either*

not Tranſitive, or if it be, has a different Object, may be rendred by a Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe, agreeing with its Object in the Ablative. 5. Rule XXXth. *A Participle, whoſe Subſtantive is neither the Subject nor Object of a Verb, nor otherwiſe governed, muſt be made by a Participle of the ſame Time, agreeing with the Subſtantive in the Ablative.* 6. Rule XXXIſt. *A Verb tranſitive or paſſive with* having, after *or* when *before it, may be rendred by the Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe, agreeing with its Object, if the Verb be Tranſitive, but its Subject, if paſſive, in the Ablative.* 7. Rule XXXIId. *A Verb not paſſive with* as, when *or* whilſt *before it, if the Subject thereof be not likewiſe in the Clauſe of the other Verb in the Sentence, may be made in* Latin *by the Participle of the preſent Tenſe agreeing with its own Subject, in the Ablative.* 8. Rule XXXIIId. *When two Verbs come together coupled by* and, *having the ſame Subject, if the former be Tranſitive, and the latter not, or if it be, have a different Object, then the former may be rendred by the Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe, agreeing with its Object in the Ablative.* 9. Rule XXXIVth. *When two Verbs come coupled by* and, *having different Subjects, the former, if paſſive, may be made by the Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe, agreeing with its own Subject in the Ablative.*

What a Rhapſody have we here of Rules, long and intricate of themſelves, and made much more ſo by the Mixture of *Logical Terms*, ſcarce ever uſed before by Grammarians! Is this Mr. *Clarke's* plain and eaſy Way of Teaching, to preſcribe ſuch Rules, as will coſt the greateſt Men no ſmall Time and Pains to comprehend them; and, as for Boys, are vaſtly more apt to confound than inſtruct them? He does well in adviſing, in his *Pref.* p. xv. that Youth ſhould not be put upon learning any Thing of Syntax, *till they have read two or three of the eaſier Claſſick Hiſtorians, ſuch as are uſually read in Schools. I mean*, adds he, *Eutropius, Nepos, Juſtin* and *Florus* (where by the by he gives us *four* inſtead of *two* or *three*) for then, as they will be more advanced in Years, it may perhaps be expected, that with due Induſtry and Labour they may come to underſtand his Rules; but if they ſhould ſet about them at the Time they begin to theſe Authors, or ſooner, I am dreadfully afraid the Knowledge of them ſhall prove extremely difficult, if not impoſſible. But then, as he would have Boys to ſtay at School till they are eighteen or twenty Years old, and in that Time would have them taught a great many Things of much more uſe than *bare Words*, what were it, tho' a Part of that Time were employed in a *Syſtem* of *Logick*, in which, among other Things, the Terms, SUBJECT and OBJECT, ſhould be nicely defined and explained? Tho' this may ſeem a prepoſterous Way of doing Buſineſs to ſome, yet a Philoſophical Head, like his, can eaſily find a Reaſon for it, namely, that

as *Thinking* goes before *Speaking*, ſo the Art of the one ſhould ceed the other; at leaſt that next and immediately after *bare rds*, (and theſe Authors, ſo long as the *Syntax* is not regarded, no more) a ſmall Compend of *Logick* ſhould take place, in or- to prepare the Boy for underſtanding the Connexion of theſe *Words* in *Sentences*; without which, according to Mr. *Clarke*'s thod, the other cannot be eaſily comprehended.

But to be ſerious in the Matter, we have here a remarkable In- ce, of what I have many Times wondred at, namely that great erſity of Fancies or Opinions that is to be found, among Perſons erwiſe of good Judgment, in Things where one would think e was little or no Occaſion for it. Mr. *Clarke* in his *Eſſay on* c. p. 113. after having ſaid, that *Lily is really very deficient in ngs neceſſary*, he immediately brings this Proof for it: "Thus, ays he, his [*Lily*'s] Rule for the *Accuſative Caſe* before the *In- nitive Mood*, *Verba infiniti modi*, &c. his Rules for the Uſe of he *Infinitive* after a *Verb* or an *Adjective*, the *Ablative abſolute*, he Uſe of the *Gerunds* and *Supines*, are all ridiculous, and con- ain no Manner of Direction; tho' theſe are Matters of Impor- ance, and neceſſary for Boys to be informed in." I have com- d Mr. *Clarke* and Mr. *Lily*'s Rules, as to theſe Matters, with all Impartiality and Exactneſs I am capable of, and I declare in the t ſincere Manner, that I am ſo far from being of Mr. *Clarke*'s iments, that unleſs in the Rule for the *Ablative abſolute* (of ch more afterwards) Mr. *Lily*'s Rules have vaſtly the Advan- , both for *Fulneſs* and *Clearneſs*, of thoſe of Mr. *Clarke*. let us conſider them particularly. And *Firſt*, as to the *Accuſa-* before the *Infinitive*, the Rules of both the one and the other as follows:

Lily, p. m. 100.

Verba infiniti modi pro No- inativo Accuſativum ante ſe atuunt:" ut, *Te rediiſſe in- nem gaudeo. Te fabulam a- volo.* Reſolvi poteſt hic mo- per *quod* & *ut*, ad hunc mo- : *Quod tu rediiſti incolumis eo. Ut tu fabulam agas volo.*

Clarke, R. X. p. 73.

When a Sentence is the Subject or Object of a Verb, the Noun before the Verb in that Sentence is the Accuſative, and the Verb the Infinitive Mood.

need not here appeal to any ingenuous Boy (who knows the ning of *Lily*'s *Latin*) whether of theſe two Rules he under- s beſt: For, I frankly own, that did I not know the Thing wiſe, I would be at a Loſs to comprehend that of Mr. *Clarke*

my

my ſelf. For, not to mention theſe *Logical* Terms of *Subject* a *Object* of a *Verb*, which will certainly perplex a Boy, he firſt te us, that this *Subject* or *Object* of a *Verb*, is to be a *Sentence*. T *Verb* then it ſelf, is no Part of that *Sentence*, unleſs it is a Part of own *Subject* or *Object*, which no body can think. And if the *Ve* is no Part of that *Sentence*, it muſt be a Part or the whole of ſo other *Sentence*, quite diſtinct from that *Sentence*, which is wh made up of its *Subject* or *Object*. I next ask, what *Mood* that *Ve* that is not a Part of that (but of ſome other) *Sentence*, muſt be in? That, I'm ſure, cannot be the *Infinitive*, but ſome other *Mo* But, as he has worded it, the *Verb* being mentioned thrice, firſt *Verb*, and then twice *the Verb*, one would very naturally think, t all along he is ſpeaking of one and the ſame individual *Verb*; and ſo, that it is to be put in the *Infinitive* Mood, which yet, as I ſa is not true of the *Verb* firſt mentioned, whoſe *Subject* or *Object* t *Sentence* is. Again, it may create ſome Difficulty to know wheth his Meaning is, that the *Noun* before the Verb, or the *Verb* itſ or *both*, make a Part or the whole of the *Sentence* he ſpeaks of. Mr. *Clarke* then has expreſt the Matter, he has given us a Riddle amuſe, rather than a Precept to inſtruct us. But ſince this Rule his neceſſarily requires two diſtinct *Verbs* to be in it, the one of *finite*, the other of the *Infinitive* Mood; and ſince he was reſol to deliver it in a *Philoſophical* Way, he ſhould have ſaid: *Whe Sentence is the Subject or Object of one Verb, and there is a Noun fore another Verb in that Sentence, the Noun is to be put in the cuſative, and the other Verb in the Infinitive Mood.* I could Notice of other Things in this Conſtruction of his; ſuch as That it is puzzling to Boys to make always out *two Sentences*, whe ever they meet with an *Infinitive* Mood, as in *Jubeo te legere*, *lectat illum ſtudere*, *Oportet rem fieri.* (2.) To diſtinguiſh which the *two Sentences* the Acculatives belong to, whether *Jubeo te*, *te facere*, *Oportet rem*, or *rem fieri.* (3.) How we ſhall know the *Verb* is to be put in the *Infinitive*, when it would ſeem, that cording to him, that is not to be done but when an *Accuſative* go before it: And if ſo, what Conſtruction have we for *Vir nus amari*, *Cupio eſſe clemens*, *Non poſſum pati*, *Deſine inep* and a great many ſuch like. But to paſs theſe, is there any T more plain, than to tell the Boy, as *Lily* and moſt others do, *as the Verb of the finite Mood requires a Nominative before it, ſo of the Infinitive Mood puts before it an Accuſative?* And if it be that oftimes the Infinitive has no Accuſative before it; that can eq ly, if not more, be objected againſt Mr. *Clarke*'s Rule.

§ 35. His *next* Quarrel againſt Mr. *Lily*, is concerning his for the Uſe of the *Infinitive*, after a *Verb* or an *Adjective*. Mr.

Words are, *Quibuſdam tum verbis tum adjectivis familiariter iciuntur verba infinita.* i. e. *The Infinitive is commonly put after Verbs or Adjectives*, or, which is the ſame Thing, *is common- overned by another Verb, and ſometimes by an Adjective.* Where e Difficulty in this, eſpecially when the Thing is of it ſelf ſo n, that a Boy of a tolerable Capacity can hardly miſtake it? But t has Mr. *Clarke* given us in Place of Mr. *Lily*'s Rule? Why, hing at all, but this ſame *Rule* X. the Obſcurity and Inſufficiency reof we have already ſhewn.

he *third* thing he objects againſt, is Mr. *Lily*'s Rule for the *Ab- ve abſolute*; which we are to conſider afterwards.

36. The *fourth* and *laſt*, is concerning the Uſe of *Gerunds* and *nes*. Now Mr. *Lily*'s Rules for theſe are much the ſame as in other Grammars, except Mr. *Clarke*'s. For *firſt*, he tells us, t they govern the Caſe of their own Verbs, which Mr. *Clarke* was obſerved above) has quite overlook'd. Then he proceeds hew what *Words* the *Gerunds*, according to their ſeveral Termi- ons or *Caſes*, depend upon, or are governed by. And that I k is the ſame Thing as to inform the Boy, that unleſs ſuch and Words go before, he is not to make Uſe of ſuch and ſuch *nds*: But if they do go before, ſuch and ſuch *Gerunds* are gene- more fit to be made Uſe of by him, than any other Word. The Rules he lays down for the Uſe of the two *Supines*. 'Tis true rs groſly, (as ſome others alſo have done) when he ſays, That *firſt* of them *are ſometimes put abſolutely with the Verb* Eſt; *as*, m eſt, Itum eſt: For *actum* and *itum* there are not *Supines*, but Neuter of the *Participles* of the Preterperfect Tenſe. But this is miſleading Boys in the Uſe of the *Supines*; but cauſing them that for a *Supine* which is not. An Error it is indeed, but a nleſs one, and which will have no Influence upon their Practice: *Saturnius*, who I think, of all the Grammarians I know, writes handſomeſt *Latin*, was however in that Miſtake. But let us ſee Mr. *Clarke*'s *Directions* concerning the Uſe of theſe *Gerunds Supines*: And all that I can find he ſays of them, is huddled up ng other Things in the two following Rules.

ule XXVI. *The* Infinitive Active *after* Sum *is made by the iciple of the Future in* rus, Paſſive *after* ſum *by the Future in* Paſſive *after an* Adjective *by the latter* Supine; Paſſive, *ſigni- the End by* ut *and the Subjunctive Mood*; Active, *ſignifying* nd *by* ut *and the Subjunctive Mood, or* ad *and the Gerund in* dum; *f the Verb be Tranſitive, by the Participle in* dus, *agreeing with Noun after it in the Accuſative.*

ule XXVII. *A Participle of the Preſent Tenſe following* of *is made he Gerund in* di; *or, if the Verb be tranſitive, by the Future in* dus,

dus, *agreeing with the Noun following in the Genitive*; *ſignifying* Means *by the Gerund in* do, *as alſo after the Prepoſitions*, *the* L *for which govern an Ablative, or if the Verb be tranſitive, by* *Participle in* dus *Ablative.*

And to this laſt he ſubjoins a Note, wherein he tells us, that *Infinitive Mood after Adjectives governing a Genitive, or where* *Participle of the Preſent Tenſe with* of *before may be put for it*, *be rendred by the Gerund in* di, *or if the Verb be tranſitive, by* *Participle in* dus *agreeing with the Noun following in the Genitive.*

§ 37. Not to mention the ſtrange Medley we have here of ſeve heterogeneous Things, *Participles*, *Gerunds*, *Supines*, *Verbs finite* *infinite*, blended together; and his making *Engliſh* a Guide to Speaking of *Latin*; of both which we are to take Notice by and I ask Mr. *Clarke*, wherein his Rules differ from thoſe of *Lily*, leſs in the *Obſcurity* and *Defects* that attend his. The *Obſcurity* viſible, from his confounding ſo many Things together. His *fects* are, that he ſays nothing of the Gerund of *di* governing Genitive plural, as *Facultas agrorum ſuis latronibus condonandi*; thing of the Gerund in *dum* of the Nominative, as, *Aut vincendum aut moriendum eſt*; nothing of the Gerund in *dum* of the Accu tive, other than that it has the Præpoſition *ad* before it; whereas has frequently other Præpoſitions, as, *Inter legendum*, *Ante dom dum*, &c. and *laſtly*, (which is ſomewhat ſtrange) nothing the *firſt Supine* at all. But laying theſe Things aſide, I ask ag what is there in Mr. *Lily*'s Rules concerning theſe *Gerunds* and *pines*, that ſhould make Mr. *Clarke* pronounce them *all ridicul* and ſay that they *contain no Manner of Direction?* I have ag and again conſidered Mr. *Clarke*'s Words, and cannot for my Li diſcover, why he ſhould paſs ſuch a condemnatory Sentence up theſe Rules of Mr. *Lily*, unleſs it be for this, that they are founded (as his *Rules* are) upon the *Engliſh* Words and Phra which anſwer to theſe *Gerunds* and *Supines* in *Latin*. But, not mention the Abſurdity of Mr. *Clarke*'s Method in this, (of which am to ſpeak more fully afterwards) where, pray, was the Uſe Neceſſity for bringing in the Words or Phraſes anſwering to *Gerunds* or *Supines*, either in *Engliſh* or any other Language? *Lily*, as all other Grammarians, ſuppoſed that Boys, before they about the Syntax, ſhould be taught the *Conjugations* of Ver and the Words or Phraſes correſponding to each Part of them their own Language, with the utmoſt Care and Exactneſs; particularly, that *amandum* ſignified Loving, *amandi*, of ving, *amando*, in, from, by, &c. loving; that *amatum* ſignifi to love, *amatu* to be loved; and ſo of others. Now this be laid down as a neceſſary Foundation to theſe and moſt other R

f Syntax, where can the Difficulty be, or what other Directions an the Boy want, other than theſe, which, I ſhall not ſay Mr. *Li*-, but the whole Bulk of Grammarians have given him, concern-ng the Conſtruction of *Gerunds* and *Supines*? For if he has been ught the *Conjugations* of Verbs in the Manner I have mentioned, nd which Mr. *Clarke* himſelf as ſtrenuouſly contends for as any; e muſt be a very dull Boy indeed, who after that does not know vithout a new Information) that ſuch *Latin* Gerunds and Supines ve always the ſame *Engliſh* Words or Phraſes anſwering to them *Sentences*, that he was taught they had in his *Conjugations*, i. e. at *amandi* always ſignified of Loving, *amando*, in, by, from ving, and ſo of the reſt. Theſe Things being fix'd and rooted s they ought) in his Mind; it will be the ſame Thing to ſpeak him of a Gerund in *di*, as of a Word which in *Engliſh* is rendred a Word in ing with of before it, or of a latter Supine, as of a ord which in *Engliſh* is rendred by a Word in ed, en, t, &c. th to be before it; which by the By, I think a better Way of ex-eſſing the Matter, even according to Mr. *Clarke*'s Way, than by lling the firſt of theſe *a Participle of the Preſent Tenſe*, and the ond *the Infinitive Paſſive*. All this is ſo plain, that I never knew Boy of a tolerable Capacity, that had any Difficulty in it, or need-any Direction about it. His Difficulty lies all another Way, and oceeds from another Cauſe; namely from this, that, as he cannot t obſerve, that there are three Parts of a Verb in the Active Voice, t are all *Engliſhed* one and the ſame Way, *viz.* the *Preſent* of the finitive, the *firſt Supine* and the *Gerund* in *dum* with *ad*: And t the ſame happens likewiſe to three Parts of it in the Paſſive ice, *viz.* the *Preſent* of the *Infinitive*, the *ſecond Supine*, and the rticiple in *dus*. As, I ſay, he cannot fail to obſerve this; ſo he l be in a Doubt, whether he may not uſe theſe three promiſcu-ly as he pleaſes; or whether there may not be ſome circumſtan-ed Caſes, in which ſometimes one, ſometimes a ſecond, and netimes a third, is only or chiefly to be made uſe of. And as it n this alone, that Directions are neceſſary, ſo it is ſo far from be- true, that *Lily* gives us *no Manner of Directions* in it, that his rections are more full and accurate than thoſe of Mr. *Clarke*.

To make this Matter more clear, let it be ſuppoſed, that a Boy theſe *Engliſh* Sentences to be rendred into *Latin*, I deſire to , I go to ſee, I am ready to ſee; and, I deſire to be ſeen, ings terrible to be ſeen, Terrible Things are to be ſeen, or out to be ſeen. Now, as the Boy is ſufficiently informed by his jugations, that *videre*, *viſum*, and *ad videndum*, all ſignify to and that *videri*, *viſu*, and *videndus*, all ſignify to be ſeen; only Difficulty with him will be, which of theſe he ought to

uſe in the forementioned Sentences, and which not: And in that Mr. *Lily*'s Rules will particularly *direct* him. For as to the three firſt of theſe Examples, he is told that when a Verb of Motion goes before, he is to uſe the *firſt Supine*; when any other Verb, the *Infinitive*; and when ſomething different from both theſe, the *Gerund* in *dum* with *ad*: Thus he learns, that for the firſt of theſe Examples, he ſhould ſay, *Cupio videre*; for the ſecond, *Eo viſum*; and for the third, *Paratus* or *promptus ad videndum*. In like Manner, as to the three laſt Examples, he is informed, that when an Adjective goes before, he is to uſe the *latter Supine*; when a Verb, the *Infinitive*; and when the Sentence may admit of about before to be, or *Duty* or *Neceſſity* is implied, by the *Participle* in *dus*; by which means he diſcovers, that for the firſt of theſe Examples he ſhould ſay, *Cupio videri*; for the ſecond, *Res terribiles viſu*; and for the third, *Res terribiles ſunt videndæ*. 'Tis true Mr. *Lily* is not ſo diſtinct as to this laſt; tho' ſomething of it may be gathered from his two laſt Rules concerning the Gerunds; for in one of them he ſays, *Cum ſignificatur neceſſitas, ponuntur* [ſciz., *Gerundia in* dum] *citra præpoſitionem, addito verbo* eſt: And in the other, *Vertuntur Gerundii voces in nomina adjectiva*. His Examples indeed are not ſo for our Purpoſe: But had they been ſuch as theſe, *Optandum eſt pacem, Videndum eſt res terribiles*; and, *Optanda eſt pax, Res terribiles ſunt videndæ*, the Thing might be tolerably underſtood. However, as it is, Mr. *Clarke* has no Reaſon to quarrel it, he having taken no Notice of that *Gerund* of the *Nominative* at all, no more than he has done of the *firſt Supine*. But here it is to be obſerved that Mr. *Lily* (and the other Grammarians that have their Rules the ſame with his) do only ſay, that the *firſt Supine* has before it a Verb of Motion, and the *ſecond* an Adjective Noun; but do not ſay that where a Verb of Motion goes before, we can *only* uſe the *firſt Supine*; or where an Adjective goes before, we can *only* uſe the *laſt Supine*: Therefore, all that is to be gathered from theſe Rules is that the Ways of Speaking above mentioned are the moſt common; but that notwithſtanding we may ſay *Eo ad videndum*, and Poetically *Eo videre*: And again, that we may ſay *Res terribiles videri*, and ſometimes *ad videndum*. The only Things we are peremptorily diſcharged to uſe, are *Cupio viſum*, and *Cupio viſu*.

I had almoſt omitted to add here, what otherwiſe deſerves our particular Notice, *viz.* That Mr. *Clarke*, in theſe Rules of his, gives a very perplexing, not to ſay a falſe Repreſentation of Things, when he calls the Participles in *rus* and *dus*, the laſt Supine and the Gerund in *dum* with *ad*, by the Name of the Infinitive; and the Gerunds in *di* and *do*, by the Name of the Participle of the Preſent Tenſe. For, beſides that in the proper *Engliſh* for *Amaturus ſum*, and *Amandi*

andus ſum, which is, I am about to love, and I am about to be loved, tho' the Word about is generally omitted, yet really to love, and to be loved, are not of the *Infinitive Mood*; and far leſs in the *Engliſh* of *Tempus legendi*, and *Defeſſus ſum legendo*, which is, Time of Reading, and I am wearied with Reading, is the Word Reading a *Participle* of the *Preſent Tenſe*, that being an Adjective and this a Subſtantive: Beſides this, I ſay, it cannot but perplex a Boy, that in ſo many Directions concerning the Infinitive and Participle of the Preſent Tenſe, he ſhould never be told when he might uſe that Mood or Participle themſelves; or even may be tempted to think that they were never to be uſed at all.

§ 38. Theſe Things being as I have repreſented them, we now clearly ſee, to which of the two the Epithet of *ridiculous* moſt juſtly does belong; whether to Mr. *Lily*, who gives us pretty full *Directions* where they are neceſſary; or to Mr. *Clarke*, who requires *Directions* where there is no Manner of Need for them; and where they really are neceſſary, gives us ſuch as are obſcure, intricate and defective; and which, if narrowly inquired into, will be found falſe and erroneous. How groundleſs then and really *ridiculous* are the Words with which Mr. *Clarke* concludes that Paragraph, *Eſſ. up. Educ. p.* 113. "Theſe and other Faults, *ſays he*, I have above taken Notice of in him [*Lily*,] are a ſufficient Reaſon for the laying him quite aſide. But as it is very difficult to prevail with Men to quit what they have once been accuſtomed to, tho' the Reaſons for a Change carry all the Light and Conviction in the World along with them, we ſhall, I am afraid, keep to our old *Mumpſimus* ſtill." Tho' Mr. *Lily*, I own, has his Faults, and theſe not a few elſewhere; yet here it is ſo far otherwiſe, that the *Light* and *Conviction* that Mr. *Clarke* idly boaſts of, ſtand full againſt himſelf and for Mr. *Lily*; and therefore, let him take what *aſſuming* Airs he pleaſes, I think I have made it evident to all judicious Men, that Mr. *Lily*'s *Mumpſimus* is incomparably better than his *ſumpſimus* or *Mumpſimus*, or call it by what Name he thinks fit.

§ 39. IV. A *fourth* Fault in Mr. *Clarke*'s Syntax is, *That too many Things are oftimes cramm'd together in one Rule.* Such as 1. *Rule* xith, where the Conſtruction of two Subſtantives, with of before the latter, of *Verbal Adjectives*, *Adjectives of Plenty and Want*, and *Adjectives put partitively*, are all brought in together. 2. *Rule* xiith, where *Sum* ſignifying *belonging to*, *Property*, &c. *Intereſt*, *refert*; *Satago*, *miſereor* and *miſereſco*; Verbs of *Remembring* and *Forgetting*; *Potior* and *Verbs of Eſteeming*, are all compris'd together under one Rule. 3. *Rule* xixth, where the *Cauſe*, *Inſtrument*, *Manner*, *Means*, *Meaſure of Magnitude*, *Price*, *Reſpect wherein*, and *Time when*, are all tacked together. And the like may be obſerved

of ſeveral other *Rules*, I know no other Reaſon for this, but that Mr. *Clarke* might have the Vanity to boaſt, that he hath reduced the *Rules* of Syntax to a much ſmaller Number than formerly, *viz.* in his *Introduction* to 28, and in his Grammar to 34. He might at this Rate, if he had pleaſed, have brought them yet into a much narrower Compaſs, with reſpect to their Number, and made a Dozen or perhaps fewer ſuffice. But who does not ſee, that ſuch a Method as this, muſt very much perplex and embaraſs Boys, where ſo many different Things are thus jumbled together? And this is yet the more unaccountable in him, who has given us no leſs than ſix diſtinct *Rules* for the *Ablative abſolute*, when all the World before him contented themſelves with one. But of this I am to ſpeak under the next Head.

§ 40. V. A *fifth* Fault in Mr. *Clarke*'s Syntax, and which I take to be the greateſt of all, is, *That he hath framed theſe Rules of his upon two very different Plans*, the *Latin* [or *Language* in *general*] being made the Standard or Ground-work of ſome of them, and the *Engliſh* of others. Of the firſt Sort, are *Rules* 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. a great Part of the 11. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. Of the ſecond Sort are *Rule* 11. Part firſt; alſo *Rules* 12. 18. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. and 34. What an odd Mixture is this? He did wiſely in condemning (as he does) Grammars writ in *Latin*, as well foreſeeing, that if the ſecond Sort of his *Rules* were delivered in that Language, they would ſcarce be intelligible, and tho' they ſhould, could only ſerve one Country. But this is not the worſt, for, if I have any Judgment in theſe Matters, it is an abſurd Way of Teaching *Latin* Syntax, to found its *Rules* upon the Manner of Speaking us'd in another Language, whoſe Nature and Conſtitution is very different from that of the *Latin*. By ſuch a Method, a Boy may indeed come to prate ſome *Latin* Sentences like a Parrot, without knowing any more of the *Latin*, than the bare Signification of the Words: But he can never enter thereby into the true Spirit and Genius of the Language. And if ever a Boy is to be brought to ſpeak true *Latin*, he muſt firſt give up with ſuch *Rules* as theſe, which ſerve for no other Uſe, but to draw him back to the Idiotiſms of his own Mother-tongue, and by jumbling *Engliſh* and *Latin* together, to render him leſs qualified for Speaking either of them aright. This muſt be an odd Way then of learning *Latin* Syntax, where the Scholar muſt forget, or not heed his *Rules*, if ever he deſigns to make any ſucceſful Progreſs in that Study; as the Experience of every one that has exerciſed himſelf in that Language muſt teſtify. To make this Matter ſomewhat more clear: Of what great Uſe can it be to the Writing of true *Latin* to tell me, as in *Rule* xxvi, that when the *Engliſh* uſe the Infinitive

ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, I muſt uſe ſometimes the Participle
rus, ſometimes that in *dus*, ſometimes the latter Supine, ſome-
es the Subjunctive with *ut*, and ſometimes the Gerund in *dum*,
ſometimes again the Participle in *dus*: In all which Circumſtances
Infinitive is to leave off to be an Infinitive to me, and to be
nged into ſomething elſe. The ſame may be ſaid of *Engliſh* Par-
les, which according to his *Rule* XXVII, *& ſeqq.* are ſometimes
e changed into Gerunds in *di* or *do*, ſometimes to continue Partici-
but to change their Tenſes, and ſometimes Verbs to be changed
them. At this Rate he might have given us as many *Metamor-*
ſes as *Ovid*, and ſhew'd that Subſtantives may be transformed in-
djectives; as, The Father's Houſe, *Domus paterna*; Adjectives
Subſtantives; as, A very learned Man. *Vir ſumma eruditio-*
Nouns into Verbs; as, Take care of your Health, *Cura va-*
dinem tuam; the ſame into Adverbs; as, He behaved himſelf
h great Bravery, *Fortiſſimè ſe geſſit*; Adverbs into Nouns; as,
did it unwillingly, *Fecit invitus*; Conjunctions into Prepoſiti-
; as, Becauſe of this Diſeaſe, *Propter hunc morbum*; and in-
nerable ſuch like. Nay he might have gone yet farther, and
w'd us how the ſame *Engliſh* Phraſe may be varied twenty diffe-
Ways in *Latin*, and the ſame *Latin* Phraſe twenty different
ys in *Engliſh*. But as none of theſe properly conſtitute the *Gram-*
ical Syntax of either Language, but are a Superſtructure only
Oratory, either natural or acquired, raiſed upon it; they ought
to be made any Part of that Syntax, otherwiſe than as they may
e ſometimes to explain and illuſtrate it.

41. I have only to add upon this Head, what I before promiſ-
concerning Mr. *Clark*'s ſix *Rules*, which he has given us, inſtead
ne, for the Conſtruction of the *Ablative abſolute*. I own that
is a Part of the *Latin* Syntax that gives Boys as great (if not
e) Trouble as any: But at the ſame Time I am fully perſuaded,
, however much Mr. *Clarke* may value himſelf upon them, theſe
es or Directions of his, when brought to Practice, ſhall be found
ttle or no Significancy in that Matter. For, not to mention the
cal Terms of *Subject* or *Object* running through them all, which
more apt, as I ſaid, to confound Boys, than inſtruct them; the
y various Shapes, into which he has thrown this Conſtruction,
not fail to diſtract their Minds, and make it very difficult for
n ſo to attend to them all, as not to blunder in ſome one or o-
. I am therefore intirely of Opinion, that there is nothing ſo
or giving Boys a true Notion of this *Conſtruction*, as teaching
n in general, that it always conſiſts of a *Subſtantive Noun* (or
noun) and a *Participle*, expreſt or underſtood, and that it can
r take Place but when that *Subſtantive* has no other Word in
the

the Sentence to *direct* or *govern* it. This is what former Gramm
rians thought ſufficient for a *Rule* in this Matter; and therefore M
Clarke needs not wonder (as he ſeems to do *p.* 104.) that he m
not with that in them which they judged unneceſſary. He tells u
with his uſual Vanity, *p.* 105, "That, as theſe Grammarians a
"generally a dry inſipid Sort of Writers, he never thought it wor
"his while to look into many of them, and therefore he know
"not but ſome amongſt them may have ſucceeded better than tho
"he has ſeen. But by the Deficiency of ſo great a Man as *Voſſ*
"and the *Oxford* Annotators, (*which, it ſeems, are all that he h*
"*read on that Head*) he ſuſpects they have not." As to *Voſſius*,
his larger Syſtem, (for it is that he means) and the *Oxford* Anno
tators, their chief Deſign being to give a critical Account or *Ra*
nale of *Grammar*, it was not to be expected that they ſhould go
bout to render every Thing plain for the Uſe of Boys, far leſs t
they ſhould tell them, when ſuch and ſuch *Engliſh* or *Dutch* Ways
Speaking were to be made *Latin* by the *Ablative abſolute*. But h
he deign'd to look into ſome other *Grammars*, (none of which,
may ſafely ſay, are more *dry* and *inſipid* than his own,) ſuch
theſe of *Aug. Saturnius*, *Geo. Urſinus*, *Tho. Ruddiman*, and not
mention more, theſe of his own Countrymen, Mr. *Farnaby* a
Mr. *Lowe*, he would have found this Rule rendred much more
telligible, and more Caſes taken Notice of (not, after his abſu
Way, having their Riſe from *Engliſh*) where it occurs, than He h
done. Nay, I am confident, that Mr. *Ruddiman* in his *Short I*
troduction to Latin *Grammar*, p. 96. has laid the Thing more op
to the Capacities of young ones, by the few *Notes* he has upon
than Mr. *Clarke* has with all his tedious and intricate *Rules* a
Notes thereon, together with his *Diſſertation* of three or four Pag
and his long Train of Examples of no leſs than ten Pages, ſubjoi
to them.

§ 42. If a *Latin* Syntax is to take any Notice of another La
guage in its Rules, it ought in my Opinion to go no further than
ſuch Things as the Signification of the Words in both Languag
are formally and preciſely agreed in. Thus, as in this Conſtructi
there muſt always be a *Participle* either expreſt or underſtood, a
that *Participle* is generally of the preſent or preterperfect Tenſe (t
of the Future either active or paſſive very rarely occurring in it
Grammarian is no further concerned than to obſerve to the S
that in *Engliſh* the Participle of the preſent Tenſe which ends
ing, is to be rendred by, at leaſt only anſwers to a *Latin* Partici
of that Tenſe which ends in *ans* or *ens*: And that the *Engliſh* P
ticiple of the preterperfect Tenſe, which commonly ends in
en, t, is to be rendred by, at leaſt only anſwers to a *Latin* Par

of the ſame Tenſe ending in *tus*, *ſus* or *xus*. But becauſe the *Engliſh* Participle of that Tenſe has generally having or being be- it, it will be of great uſe to the Boy to have it moreover par- larly obſerved to him, that the *Engliſh* Participle with having anſwers to a *Latin* Participle that is *deponent*; and that the *Engliſh* one with being only anſwers to a *Latin* one that is *paſſive*: that therefore to prevent Miſtakes, it will be convenient for e time at leaſt, that when having is to be rendred by a *paſſive* iciple, he in his own Mind change it into being, and when g is to be rendred by a *deponent* Participle, that he change it having. This is all, I think, that a Grammarian, who would the true *Correſpondence* that is between the two Languages in *Rule*, ought to do. If he will carry the Matter farther than and purſue it through all the various Turns and Changes the *Latin Ablative abſolute* may receive in *Engliſh*, or indeed other modern Language, I ſee not when or where he can ſtop. , tho' it were poſſible, as I believe it is not, to bring this Mat- within the Compaſs of certain fix'd *Rules*; yet I am perſuaded, they would be ſo far from doing the Learner any real Service, the Oddneſs, as well as Multiplicity of them, would (as theſe of *Clarke*) rather confound than direct him. This is a Thing not effected by *Rules*, but by much Reading and Practice, as every converſant in the two Languages muſt own; and is no more what Mr. *Clarke* himſelf acknowledges, as in ſeveral other Pla- ſo particularly in his *Eſſay upon Educ.* laſt Edit. *p.* 163, where king of the Difficulty of acquiring a true *Latin* Style, he has theſe rds. "Now this Difficulty, *ſays he*, is ſo great, that when a oy has perfectly maſtered his Syntax, and is very ready and dex- ous at it, he has yet ten Times more Work upon his Hands, an he went through in the Learning of his Syntax, before he n come at any Thing of a proper Style in the writing of *Latin*, I have above taken Notice, and as every Man muſt be ſenſible, at knows much of the *Latin* Tongue, and conſiders how PRO- IGIOUSLY DIFFERENT the Manner of Expreſſion in that anguage is from that of our own." And again, *p.* 177. "The *atin* Tongue differs ſo WIDELY from the *Engliſh*, with Reſpect the Manner of Expreſſion, or Idiom thereof, that without a od Command of Words in the latter, a Man muſt make very rry Work of it, in the conſtruing of the Claſſicks." What an nd fruitleſs Attempt is it then in Mr. *Clarke*, to endeavour by s to conform the Expreſſions of two Languages (which by his Confeſſion are ſo PRODIGIOUSLY different) to one ano- ? And ſince that Difference does take place in other Parts of ax as well as this, why does he not uſe the ſame Method with

Re-

Reſpect to them? But this, it would ſeem, he reſerves for an
ter-game: For in his *Grammar*, p. 118, after he has boaſted no
little of the great Advantages to be reap'd from theſe *ſix Rules* of h
concerning the Syntax of the *Ablative abſolute*, eſpecially theſe *thr*
of them, which he has ſo largely exemplify'd, he tells the Reade
that he deſigns " to publiſh a Supplement to his *Introduction to t*
" *making of* Latin, on purpoſe *not only* to exemplify, in the M
" thod obſerved in that Book, theſe additional Rules; *but alſo* ſom
" other he is in queſt of, relating to the Difference betwixt the Id
" om of the *Latin* and *Engliſh* Tongues, if he can but ſettle thes
" to his Satisfaction." And then he concludes with telling th
World, " That the Succeſs he has met with upon the *Caſe* of th
" *Ablative abſolute*, has put him upon a new Scent, and what th
" may produce in Time, whether any Thing conſiderable enoug
" to be offered to publick View, he cannot certainly tell yet." T
all which I ſhall only ſay, that if this *magnus tanto promiſſor hia*
cannot yet *tell* what this new Scent he is upon may produce, f
leſs is it to be expected that any other ſhould. But I will ventur
to *foretel*, that if it ſhall be of no more uſe to Boys than what h
has given them upon the *Ablative abſolute*, they will be fully as we
without it. For however it may amuſe, or perhaps entertain, tho
that are already acquainted with the different Geniuſes of the tw
Languages; yet it ſhall not eaſily enter into my Thoughts, that ſu
a Method as this is a fit one for teaching young ones *Latin*, or n
deed any Language whatſoever, where the Idiom of it runs ſo wid
ly off from that of another Language which is thus made the M
del of it. We have had ſeveral Projects of this Kind ere now, ſuc
as Mr. *Cole*'s *Nolens volens* and *Syncriſis* in *England*, and Mr. *Wa*
Ten Particles with us, and that probably borrowed from an *Engl*
Original: But I never heard that theſe did any good (but rather t
contrary) to the bringing of Youth to a true *Latin* Style.

§ 43. I have now done with Mr. *Clarke*'s *Grammar*, and th
there is none that declaims with ſo great Fierceneſs as he againſt (
ſhall not ſay poor *Lily*'s Syſtem, but) almoſt all *Grammars*, as we
as the *Teachers* of them, who, he ſays, *Eſſ. on Educ.* p. 31, *are*
all Men the greateſt Bunglers in their Profeſſion: Yet, I think, I ha
made it appear, that he is ſo far from mending the Matter, th
there are very few that have writ upon that Subject, whoſe Perfo
mances are more liable to Exception than his own. He confeſs
indeed, *Eſſ. upon Educ.* p. 28, " That it is much eaſier to compla
" of the Grievance of *Lily*'s Grammar, than to remedy it:" An
the continual Diſappointments which a great many Authors, wh
have ſince his Time attempted it, and who each in his Turn fancie
he had at laſt hit upon a right one, have met from the Publick, ſu
ficient

ently confirm what he ſays. But, after ſo many Faults which I e diſcovered in his Grammar, I am aſtoniſhed that he ſhould im- diately add, "Not, *ſays he*, that I look upon it as any great Difficulty to compile one more eaſy, ſhort and compendious, and yet more full and complete." To compile a *ſhort* and *compendi- Grammar*, after the Manner that his is done, is indeed a Mat- of no Difficulty: But at the ſame Time, to make it yet *more full d complete* than a *large* and *comprehenſive* one (ſuch as *Lily*'s is) Thing ſo Difficult, that it is in my Opinion next to impoſſible. wever, he continues to tell us, *ibid.* that *he has already done it great Meaſure in his* Introduction to the making of *Latin*; and Doubt, in this new Performance, he has, in his Conceit, altoge- finiſhed and perfected the Matter. But by this Time, I think, s or may be convinced of his bad Succeſs, and that to compile a t Grammar, either in *Engliſh* or *Latin*, is not ſo eaſy a Thing as magin'd. I have diligently compared his with the common one in uſe in *England*, and can with good Aſſurance ſay, that the r (bad and inſufficient as it is) is yet in many Reſpects prefer- to the former, tho' it had no publick Authority to ſupport or mmend it. He is fond indeed (and I ſhall not diſpute the Ex- iency of it) of having a new *Grammar* ſubſtituted in the Place he old one; and it is not improbable, that after the high Enco- ms he gives to his own Performance, and the great Encourage- nts he boaſts of having met with in other Things of that Kind, ainly hopes that his will be made Choice of, and authorized by . But however much he may talk of having an *Act* of *Parlia- t* made for aboliſhing of Mr. *Lily*'s *Grammar*, yet I ſhall never ve that the Wiſdom of that great and learned Nation ſhall be ſo employed as to eſtabliſh his. If it ſhall, it will require a very ng and forcible Sanction to make it without murmuring to be erſally received; and in particular, to cauſe his Doctrine concern- the *Vocative* Caſe and *Supines* to paſs, it will in my Opinion be ſſary that ſome ſuch Clauſe as this ſhould be adjected: Provid- always, and be it further enacted by the Authority afore- , That in all Schools and Seminaries of Learning, where Latin Tongue is taught, the Vocative ſhall not for hereafter mentioned among the Number of the Caſes, nor any Supines made uſe of but what are to be found in good Latin Authors, Law, Statute or Cuſtom to the contrary notwithſtanding. Body I hope will miſtake me, as if I were here dallying with *Acts* of *Parliament*, and far leſs with that ſupreme *Authority* which they proceed; this being a Thing equally removed from Intention and Duty. All that I deſign, is only to expoſe the ſumption of a Man, who will needs take upon him to give

ſuch Directions to the *Legiſlative Power*, as, I am perſwaded, the great Wiſdom will be ſo far from hearkning to, that *if* ever they *ſhall* (as he wiſhes, *Pref.* p. 5. they would) *take that Matter under Conſideration*, they will eſtabliſh for a national *Latin* Grammar one that is compiled in a Method, if not quite contrary to, at leaſt very much different from his.

****

SECT. IV.

Of the Uſe Mr. Clarke *would have to be made of his* Literal Tranſlations.

THE laſt Thing I deſign to take Notice of, in Mr. *Clarke's* Method of teaching the *Latin* Tongue, is concerning his *Literal Tranſlations:* In which I have two Things to obſerve. *1ſt*, The great Pother and Noiſe he makes about them, as if ſuch mighty Feats could be performed by them, as were never thought on before. And, *2dly*, The ſtrange and unaccountable Manner in which he would have them to be made uſe of.

§ 1. I. As to the firſt of theſe, *viz. the great Noiſe Mr.* Clarke *makes about theſe his literal Tranſlations, and the mighty Feats he ſays can be performed by them:* I muſt premiſe, that I would not have it underſtood, as if I was an Enemy to ſuch *Tranſlations*. I am ſo far from it, that I believe they may be of good Uſe both to *Scholar* and *Maſter*. To the former, becauſe at the Beginning they make Things ſomewhat plainer and eaſier to him, than otherwiſe they would be: To the latter, becauſe he is thereby furniſhed with *Engliſh* Words and Phraſes, which with more Propriety and Exactneſs correſpond to the *Latin*, than he perhaps of himſelf would have hit on. If this will ſatisfy Mr. *Clarke*, I ſhall very readily allow him: But when he carries the Matter to a much greater Height and boaſts of other and vaſtly greater Advantages to be reapt from thoſe *Tranſlations*, he will excuſe me to be of a different Sentiment till ſuch Time at leaſt as he ſhall have made the Thing clearer than it yet is to my Apprehenſion. He tells us indeed, *Eſſay upon Ed.* p. 31. after his haughty and dictatorial Manner, "That the common Method is compleatly ridiculous. For, *adds he*, what miſerable pottering Work do the poor Boys make of it, every where for the firſt two or three Years, for Want of this Help, ſo eaſily be had, and ſo viſibly neceſſary, that it is perfectly amazing that they ſhould ſo long together have been unfurniſhed with it." Then he goes on to run down the whole Tribe of Schoolmaſters for their blundering Conduct in this Affair, merely, it would ſeem, becauſe they were not provided with theſe *Tranſlations*, the Diſcovery whereof

, as that of *America* to the famous *Columbus*, was reſerved to the reat Mr. *Clarke*. I confeſs indeed, that if the Practice in *England*, efore his *literal Tranſlations* were invented, was ſuch as he deſcribes , it was bad enough. For he tells that the Cuſtom there is, after e Reading of Half a Score of Pages in *Cordery* and *Æſop*'s *Fables*, at Boys are next entred into *Eraſmus*, which they are obliged to arn *by the Help of a Dictionary, with ſome ſmall Aſſiſtance only the Maſter in the moſt difficult Places.*

One can hardly think that any judicious Maſter in *England* (and hope there are many ſuch beſides Mr. *Clarke*) would take up with ch an aukward and unreaſonable Way of doing Buſineſs, as (not mention other Things) to remit Boys ſo ſoon to Dictionaries for arning their Leſſons. But, whatever is in that, I am ſure that in otland, when I was at School, and I believe it is ſo to this Day, ery different Method was followed; namely this, That after Boys d been taught their Declenſions and Conjugations in the moſt ex- t Manner, and together with theſe were alſo inſtructed in the ief Rules of Syntax, and ſo were judged fit to have ſome eaſy hool *Author*, ſuch as *Cordery*, put into their Hands; the Maſter mſelf did in the *firſt* Place range every Sentence in the natural Or- r of the Words, and then once and again tranſlated each Word e by one, in the ſame Order, into their true and literal Significa- n. This being done, he *next* cauſed one or more of that Claſs, or rm, to tranſlate what is thus preſcrib'd them in the ſame Manner had done, and that once or oftner, as Occaſion ſhould require. *irdly*, they were ordered to their Seats, there to confer and re- at that Leſſon among themſelves, till they were Maſters of it. *bly*, In the Afternoon (for commonly a Meal and ſome Diverſion erven'd betwixt them) he again call'd up the Claſs, to give an count of that Leſſon in the Manner they had been taught it; and rivet and fix every Thing the better in their Minds, they were o- ged to *analyſe* (as we call'd it) or *parſe* every Word in each Sen- nce very particularly, adding the *Engliſh* proper to all the Varia- ns of them. And to conclude all, they were ordered to ſhew w the Words were conſtrued together, and to give ſuch Rules as y had been taught for each Conſtruction. To which was fre- ently added the accuſtoming them to vary the Sentences or Phra- of their Leſſons to other ſimilar ones, as the Diſcretion of the after, and their Time and Proficiency made it proper. This, with other Exerciſes mentioned above, *p.* 36. was, and I hope ſtill is, Method in our Schools; and I am perſuaded that when Things thus managed by an able and diligent Maſter, the Boy will be no great Loſs for Want of Mr. *Clarke*'s *Tranſlations*. I ſhall not re mention other wiſe Contrivances made uſe of by ſome judicious

Maſters, ſuch as that recommended by Mr. *Clarke* himſelf, *Eſſay on Educ. p.* 99, of making Boys write by Way of Exerciſe, every Night, ſome Part of their Leſſon both in *Latin* and *Engliſh*: And particularly another, which I think a very good one, of ſetting a part once in a Fortnight, a whole Fore or Afternoon, for the Declenſions and *Conjugations*, eſpecially the latter, becauſe Boys are generally moſt deficient in them. In this Kind of Exerciſe (the Time whereof I would call the *Conjugation-Day*,) it were not improper to turn all, or moſt of the Claſſes of the School, into a *Committee*, as it were, *of the whole Houſe*, and that they ſhould be examin'd on thoſe Things without Diſtinction: Both becauſe of the abſolute Neceſſity all are equally under, of perfectly knowing theſe Things; and that it is but too often found, that few are ſo exact in them, as not to need frequently to be reminded of them.

§ 2. But all that I have ſaid, is of little Uſe, it would ſeem, in Compariſon of Mr. *Clarke*'s *Literal Tranſlations*. For he tells us in his *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 34. "That a Man might ſafely venture his "Reputation upon it, that a Boy by the Help of *thoſe literal Tranſlations* would do more in one Year, than without them, i. e. by "*any other Method*, he would do in three or four." But becauſe Mr. *Clarke* talks here of his *Tranſlations*, as *Quacks* and *Empirics* do of their *Grand Secrets*, *Catholicons* and *Elixirs*; and 'tis but prudent we ſhould take Care not to be impoſed upon either by them or him; he muſt allow me to ask him the Queſtion, what *that* is the acquiring whereof is rendred ſo expeditious by his *Tranſlations* beyond what can be done by any other Method. If he means (as one would be tempted to think by what he ſays of theſe Things elſewhere) *Hiſtory*, *Geography*, *Chronology*, &c. what he advances is equally falſe and impertinent: The former, becauſe the Things I have named can be much more expeditiouſly learned without any *Latin* at all; the latter, becauſe not theſe, but the acquiring of the Language, is (as he himſelf confeſſes) the Boy's chief and proper Buſineſs at School. If his Meaning is, that the Boy will learn by his Method many more *Latin* Vocables in *one Year*, than without it, he will do in *three or four*; beſides, that I am pretty confident, that even this is not true, I further add, that it is of ſmall Importance tho' it were true, as being a quite different Thing from learning the Language, as I ſhall ſhew afterwards. It remains then, that if Mr. *Clarke* ſpeaks Senſe upon the Head, his Meaning ſhould be, that a Boy by the Help of his *Tranſlations*, ſhall acquire more of the Art of Speaking or Writing *Latin in one Year*, than without them he can do *in three or four*. And this is what I not only abſolutely deny, but on the contrary do maintain, that a Boy ſhall do more, to the Purpoſe I have mentioned, in three or four Years, without his

Tran-

anſlations, than he can do in an Age with them, if he is to make other Uſe of them than He preſcribes.

§ 3. But as I have reſerved this for the Subject of my ſecond Obſervation, I ſhall not anticipate it here, but go on to conſider thoſe *anſlations* in general, what Way ſoever they may be uſed, (for I not ſay but that they may be of ſome Uſe) either by Mr. *Clarke* any Body elſe. And even in this View of them, I ſee no Reaſon, hy Mr. *Clarke* ſhould ſo far extol theſe *Tranſlations* of his, as if thing could be done to Purpoſe without them. For I can aſſure m, that I have known many Boys, who in *five Years* Time, and me in *three* or *four*, by the Method mentioned above, without e Help of his or any other *Tranſlations*, but what they had from e Mouths of their Maſters, have made all that Progreſs that he ſires, at leaſt *expects*, to be made at School, *viz.* that *they could ſily and familiarly read uſeful Books writ in* Latin. For ſo in the *face* to his *Grammar*, *p.* xi. he expreſly tells us, *That the ſole caſion the Generality of thoſe that are bred to Learning* (*ninety ne in a hundred, to ſpeak within Compaſs*) *have for that Language*, no more. Not that thoſe Boys were ſure of the Author's Meang in every Inſtance; that being more than the *compleat Maſters* and *iticks* in the *Latin* Tongue, he ſpeaks of a little before, can proſe upon; and in which I could ſhow, that Mr. *Clarke* himſelf is, ner than he is aware, miſtaken. It is enough to my Purpoſe, t they could in that Time ſo read an *uſeful Proſe-Author* (for he es not pretend that his *literal Tranſlations* will do with a *Poetical* e) as with Eaſe to take up the Senſe and Scope of the Words: Or t any Time they met with Rubs and Difficulties, which often hapns to the greateſt *Criticks* in theſe Matters, it was in ſuch Things a good Maſter or Commentator would do them much more Sere than is to be had from Mr. *Clarke*'s Tranſlations.

§ 4. But laying aſide Compariſons, let us more particularly conſider theſe *Tranſlations* in themſelves; and herein I make no Scruple declare, that, ſuch is my Dulneſs, I cannot for my Heart diſcover theſe mighty Wonders that he affirms can be wrought by them. I can ſee in them is of little more Uſe than this, that at a Boy's try to the Reading of a *School-Author*, ſuch as *Cordery* or *Eraſ-s*, by having every Word placed in its natural Order, and its per *Engliſh* in the ſame Order over againſt it, he will be made to ieve, that the Difficulty in learning *Latin* is leſs than it really is. is, I confeſs, may be a prudent Stratagem againſt the Boy's being couraged at his firſt Setting out. But how far will this go, or w long will it laſt with him? The Time is very ſoon to come, en he muſt read the true Claſſick Authors in that Order in ich they were originally written; which tho' in itſelf it conſti-

tutes

tutes a chief Part of the Beauty of the Language, and is almoſt eſſen-
tial to it, yet it is that which creates the great Perplexity and Hard-
ſhip the Boy meets with at firſt, from the Difference he finds be-
tween the Order of the *Latin*, and that of his own Language. An
then, notwithſtanding what Mr. *Clarke* has done with *Cordery* and
Eraſmus, it will appear that the great Difficulty is not removed, but
put off: And now that he is obliged to grapple with it, he will
find that the Learning of *Latin* is not ſo eaſy as he at firſt fancied
to be, and will be apt to think he was impoſed upon, when the
Thing was otherwiſe repreſented to him. But whatever is in that
and how proper ſoever it may be at firſt to conceal or diſſemble this
Difficulty, till he is ſomewhat advanced; yet it is my Opinion, that
that Method ſhould not be carried any great Length, and that a few
Colloquies of *Cordery* may be ſufficient for this Initiation; the reſt
with *Eraſmus* being continued in their artificial Order. This I think
were better, than to engage him with two or more great Difficul-
ties at once, *viz.* the *Intricacy* of the Words, and *Length* of the
Sentences, as well as the *Obſcurity* of the Subject treated of. For
all theſe the Boy will meet with, when he paſſes from *Eraſmus* to
Eutropius, *Nepos* or *Ceſar*, where the true *Latin* Order takes Place.

§ 5. But allowing *Cordery* and *Eraſmus* to paſs as Mr. *Clarke*
would have them; I do not ſee any great Advantage to be gathered
from his other *Tranſlations*, otherwiſe than as they may furniſh the
Maſter, as I ſaid, with fitter Words or Phraſes, than perhaps he
could think of without them. For if the Maſter's Expoſition is
literal, and in as well choſen Words as Mr. *Clarke*'s, (as in a vast
Number of Inſtances it can be improved) I think it will rather do
better with the Scholar, as it is a greater Spur to Attention and In-
duſtry: Whereas the other ſeems an Encouragement to Lazineſs, by
his having all done in his Book to his Hand. For Mr. *Clarke* (I
hope) will not think it ſufficient for learning theſe Authors, that
the Scholar ſhould be able to read them firſt in *Latin* and then in
Engliſh from a Book. No certainly; that will do him little Service
unleſs he can alſo deliver one, if not both, without Book, and know
by Heart which Words in both anſwer to one another. And that
this is Mr. *Clarke*'s Deſign, is pretty clearly intimated to us by him-
ſelf, *Eſſay upon Educ. p.* 99, where he adviſes, "That Boys, when
"they enter *Cordery*, ſhould be cauſed write, or get without Book
"a few Lines of it every Night, by Way of Exerciſe, rendring each
"Word with *Engliſh*, after the Manner of *Hool*'s conſtruing Book
"to the Grammar." And the ſame Method he would have taken
with them in the other Authors, till they are fit to be entred on
ſome Book of *Engliſh Examples* to their *Syntax*, i. e. to his *Intro-
duction*. Now where is the great Odds in all this from the old Me-
thod

od? For if the Maſter puts firſt the Words of the Author into eir natural Order, and then gives a literal Interpretation of them moſt one by one in *Engliſh*, the ſame Memory that retains them hen the Book is laid aſide, will likewiſe retain them from the Ma-r's Mouth. And if it ſhall be ſaid, that when the Boy forgets, or like to go wrong, he has always his Book at Hand, with the *lite-l Tranſlation*, to remind or correct him: I anſwer, that if the Ma-er is as diligent as he ought to be, in cauſing him to go over his eſſon again and again, till he fully underſtands it, the Matter will laſt come to much the ſame Iſſue. And if this ſhall ſeem too eat a Toil to the Maſter, which yet one that makes Conſcience of Buſineſs ought not to grudge, I add, that in a ſhort Time, the bour of both will gradually decreaſe: Inſomuch, that with Boys a tolerable Capacity, one ſingle Interpretation will almoſt be ſuf-ient; and when they are well advanced in the eaſier Authors, ey will be able to do the moſt Part by their own Induſtry: Tho' my Opinion, they ought very little to be left to that; but ſhould, poſſible, ſo long as they are at School, have every Leſſon firſt ex-ain'd to them by the Maſter, in a Tranſlation cloſer or freer, ac-rding as their Proficiency ſhall require.

§ 9. There is one Inconvenience at leaſt, in the Uſe of Mr. *Clarke's* anſlations, which happens not the other Way: Namely, That Maſter cannot ſo well be ſure of the Boy's Diligence. For, in ndring his Leſſon into *Engliſh*, when ever he is brought to a Pinch, will be peeping into the *Engliſh* Column, if poſſibly he can do it thout being diſcovered. Whereas, by having nothing but the o-inal *Latin* in his Hand, he is utterly depriv'd of that Shift. To nclude this Point, if Mr. *Clarke* is to be underſtood concerning Proficiency Boys are to make in the true Knowledge of the Lan-ge by the Help of his *Tranſlations*, there ſhall no great Diffe-ce, *cæteris paribus*, be found with reſpect to Time, betwixt his the ancient Method; and (unleſs there is ſomething of Conjura-n in the Matter) the Odds he boaſts of *one* to *three* or *four*, will found an abſolute Jeſt and Rodomontade.

But it would ſeem that Mr. *Clarke*'s Tranſlations are by him de-'d for quite another Purpoſe than what I have mentioned, and t all he intends is, that a Boy by the Help of them, ſhall lay in a eater Stock of *Latin* Words, and the *Engliſh* Significations of them, *one Year*, than without them he will do in *three* or *four*. If this ll the End that Mr. *Clarke* drives at, (which, as will appear by at follows, very probably it is) tho' I have no Reaſon to allow, n on that Suppoſition, the Odds he ſpeaks of; we have hereby ew Method of *Education* propoſed unto us, never, that I know, rd of before. And this brings me,

§ 7.

§ 7. II. To consider *the strange and unaccountable Manner in which Mr.* Clarke *would have these his Translations to be made use of.* And this, as in other of his Works, so more particularly, in his *Essay upon Educ.* p. 100. he informs us, is, *That all the while that Boys are going through, not only* Cordery, but the *other Authors that are to follow him,* he means *Erasmus, Eutropius, Nepos, Justin* and *Florus:* Nay he adds, *till they begin to read* Cæsar *indifferently well,* he would not have them to be taught any Thing of *Syntax* at all. And, as if these Authors were not enough, in his 2d Edition, p. 99, he adds to them *Terence,* which, says he, *when Boys have got through, or if that shall be thought with the latest, when they enter that Author,* and consequently after *Cæsar* and the others afore mentioned, *it will be Time,* i. e. no sooner, *to put them to the Syntax.* But in his *Grammar,* p. xv. that these young Soldiers, being entangled with as little Baggage as possible, may with the greater Expedition run through that long Train of Authors I have named, (which he has *ventured his Reputation upon it,* to have done, it would seem, in one Year,) he advises that besides the *Syntax,* and the *Heteroclites* and *Preterites of Verbs,* (both which, had it not been for the Sake of *weak Readers,* he would have omitted himself out of his *Grammar*) they *should not meddle with any Thing* of the *Gender of Nouns* further than his general *Rules,* leaving out the *Exceptions;* before they have read over *Corderius, Erasmus, Eutropius, Nepos, Justin* and *Florus.* This was wisely contrived, and perhaps may do with some Boys, when their Master's *Reputation* is not stak'd upon it; and the more especially, that for their Encouragement, when they become as it were *gravis armaturæ milites,* i. e. are to carry the *Syntax,* and other weighty Accoutrements relating thereto, along with them, they are to proceed with slow and easy Marches, suitable to the Circumstances they are then to come into. For so he has ordered, *ibid.* that with very leisurely Steps they should go through four of the principal *Rules* of *Construction,* dwelling upon each of them a good Time before they pass to another. And left this *Grammaticus* αὐτοδιδάκτῳ and αὐτοδιδάσκων, should seem to take Directions from any before him, in the right marshalling of these his *Rules,* after the Agreement of a *Verb* with its *Nominative,* he gives the next Place to a *Transitive Verb*'s governing the *Accusative.* Then he brings in the *Government* of the *Prepositions.* And lastly (that which most Grammarians place first of all) the *Concord* of an *Adjective* with its *Substantive; for which,* and between that, it would seem, and the Rule for Prepositions, he would have them *prepared by being taught the Genders of Nouns. When they have made this Progress,* he next will have a Book of *English Examples,* i. e. his *Introduction* to be put into their Hands. Which last

must

muſt be ſo cloſely ply'd, that, ſays he, *the Reading of Authors ought a great Meaſure to be laid aſide to make Room for it; and their hole Time employ'd upon it, till they have throughly maſter'd it.*

§ 8. This in general is the Method Mr. *Clarke* would have fol-wed in ſtudying the *Latin* Tongue. As to the laſt Part whereof, iz. the *Syntax*, and his peculiar Way of managing it, having ſuffi-ently ſpoke of that already, I am no further to trouble either my lf or my Reader about it. What I am now upon is, to conſider w he would have Boys to be employ'd, before they are come that ngth. And that we ſee is, that they ſhould go through eight Au-ors, *Corderius*, *Eraſmus*, *Eutropius*, *Nepos*, *Juſtin*, *Florus*, *Cæſar* d *Terence*; the firſt ſix with, and the two laſt (as yet) without *Tranſlations*, before they meddle with any Thing of *Syntax* at . This (I confeſs) to me is incomprehenſible; and what he talks *Reading* of Authors, and particularly *Cæſar indifferently well*, thout knowing any Thing of the Conſtruction of the Words, is hat as yet I have no Notion of. I can hardly think but that by *ading* Mr. *Clarke* means ſomething elſe, than that a Boy ſhould be able to pronounce the Words aright: For if that is all, the Mat-is not very difficult, and any *Latin* Book is as well calculated for Purpoſe as *Cæſar*. Far leſs can the knowing of ſo much of the *man* Hiſtory, as is contained in theſe Authors, be called the *Read-* of them in their own Language. As it is then in neither of theſe nſes, I ſuppoſe, that Mr. *Clarke*'s Words are to be taken, and as re only remain other two poſſible Senſes that can be put upon m, it neceſſarily follows that they muſt be taken in one of theſe. r *firſt*, by *Reading* he either means that a Boy by going through ſe Authors comes to underſtand the *general Signification* of all the cables of other Words contain'd in them: Or *ſecondly*, that they reby in ſome Meaſure become acquainted with the particular Na-e and Genius of the Language, and can (tho' as yet in a very im-fect Degree) imitate and copy after its Way of Speaking. Now ' it is this laſt alone, that truly and properly can be called *Read-*; yet it cannot be in this Acceptation of the Word, that Mr. *rke* is here to be underſtood; for this invincible Reaſon, that it ceſſarily ſuppoſes and includes in it the Knowledge of *Syntax*, m which all the while he abſolutely diſcharges his Diſciples, not fering them in the leaſt to *meddle with it* at all. It remains then t by *Reading*, and that pretty *well* too, Mr. *Clarke* means no re than a general Knowledge of the *Signification* of ſo many ords, without underſtanding any Thing of the Reaſon why the flinable Kinds of them undergo ſuch and ſuch Changes, when y are put together in *Sentences*. This is to me a new and very proper Senſe of the Word *Reading*, and quite different from that

in which he himſelf uſes it, *p.* 64. where, arguing againſt the C
ſtom of putting Boys upon the compoſing of *Latin* Verſes at Schoo
he among other Things inſinuates, that Boys at the Time they a
put upon theſe Exerciſes are not *well able to read a plain* Latin *A
thor*; which, in the Senſe that he now gives that Word, cann
poſſibly be ſuppoſed. But to let this *Reading* paſs in the Signific
on he now puts upon it, what does it amount to? Why, to
more than this, that hereby theſe Authors are turned into ſo ma
Vocabularies or *Nomenclatures* of all the Words they contain. E
where indeed, *p.* 27. he highly exclaims againſt the Uſe of ſu
Books, and calls them *mere Baubles* and *vain Amuſements*; chiefly
would ſeem that his *Tranſlations* may occupy their Place.

Tho' it is pretty obvious from what I have ſaid, that this is
moſt all the Uſe, with Reſpect to the Language, that Mr. Cla
would have to be made of his *Tranſlations*, yet that we might
the ſurer of his Intention, he tells us, *p.* 33. "That Boys only
"ſineſs, when they firſt ſet forward in the Reading of their
"thors, i. e. *all theſe he hath tranſlated*, is to get acquainted w
"the preciſe Meaning and proper Import of *Latin* Words." A
p. 34. *That the Uſe of his Tranſlations has no Difficulty in it*;
that it employs nothing but Memory. 'Tis true that, *p.* 99, as
before obſerved, he adviſes, "That Boys ſhould write, or get w
"out Book, a few Lines of *Cordery* and his other Authors, ren
"ing each Word with *Engliſh*, after the Manner of *Hool's conſ
"*ing Book*." Tho' it looks ſomething like a Contradiction to
of *conſtruing* without *Conſtruction*; yet I ſuppoſe he means no m
than that Boys ſhould by ſuch Exerciſes as theſe be the better enab
to fix the Signification of each Word by itſelf in their Memories.
ſo, I ſee no other Difference between the Uſe he would have to
made of theſe Authors, with Reſpect to the Language, and th
Vocabularies he ſo much condemns, but that in the former the Wo
by their lying together in Sentences, and frequently recurring in
ther Places of the ſame Authors, will more eaſily be retained
Boy's Mind, than where they are, as in the latter, ſeparately
but once mentioned, without any Connection one with anot
This being the Caſe, and ſince nothing but *mere Memory*, as he
himſelf, is required in all this Affair, it will of neceſſity follow,
could a Boy as firmly retain all the Words in his *Vocabulary*, as
ther can do an equal Number of the ſame or the like Words in
Authors, they will have made an equal Proficiency in the Langu
But how ſmall is this Proficiency, and of how little Importanc
the true Knowledge of the *Latin* Tongue, ſo long as they un
ſtand nothing of *Conſtruction* or *Syntax*? They are all the whil
far removed from it, as a *Quarry-man* is from an *Architect*,

ll-gatherer from a *General*; or, which is much the ſame, as a Heap *Timber* and *Stone* is from a beautiful *Edifice*, or a Number of *en diſperſed* through a Country is from a *regular Army*; in Allu- n to which theſe two Words *Conſtructio* and *Syntaxis* had their ames given them. I will not carry Things ſo far as the famous *nctius* does, who ſays, *Minerv. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Mihi perfectus abſolu- ſque Grammaticus eſt ille, qui in Ciceronis vel Virgilii libris intelli- quæ dictio ſit nomen, quæ verbum, & cætera,* [under which *Syn-* is eſpecially comprehended] *quæ ad ſolam Grammaticam ſpe- nt, etiamſi ſenſum verborum non intelligat:* But I make no Dif- ulty to affirm, that tho' a Man could be ſuppoſed to have got all Words of a *Latin* Dictionary, with all their various Significati- s, by Heart; yet if he proceeded no farther, they would (like the ſt *Chaos*) be nothing elſe to him but a rude and undigeſted Heap *Materials*, without any *Form* at all. Now, if it is *Syntax* alone, no Body doubts it is, that brings them into this *Form*, and if that axim of the Philoſophers holds true, that *Forma dat eſſe rei*, we y eaſily judge how ſmall Account ought to be made of a Boy's nning through ſo many *Authors*, without knowing any Thing the *Syntax* of them: And conſequently how abſurd and unrea- nable ſuch a Method is, that contributes ſo little to the Ends it is ſigned for. This is a Thing appears to me ſo evident, that to coun- Mr. *Clarke*'s vain Boaſting in this Matter, I do maintain, that a y, who has been taught *Cordery* only, in the Manner I have de- ibed above, *i. e.* who not only knows the Signification of the ords, but can alſo parſe and conſtrue them, and in ſome Meaſure irate his Diction and Phraſeology (all which may be done with- t looking into any other Author;) I do maintain, I ſay, that h a Boy really and truly knows vaſtly more of the *Latin* Tongue, an if he ſhould have read over not only all theſe Mr. *Clarke* men- ns, but all the Authors of that Language, in the Manner that he eſcribes. This may ſeem *a Paradox* to ſome Perſons, but cannot ell appear ſo to him, when he calls to Mind what he ſays himſelf the *Pref.* to his *Grammar*, p. iv. where among other Arguments ainſt *Latin Grammars*, he uſes this; That notwithſtanding the *Eng- h Schools are provided with a conſtruing Book to* Lily; *yet it is not* Latin, *but* Hool's Engliſh, *that Boys learn the Grammar Rules by.* ly's *Language*, adds he, *is utterly uſeleſs and ſtands for nothing.* ow if the Language of *Lily*'s Grammar, notwithſtanding that Boys e not to ſet about it, till they are antecedently prepared for it by through Knowledge of the Declenſions and Conjugations, and tolerable Skill in the chief Rules of *Syntax*, and the additional Aſ- ſtance of a *conſtruing Book* for that Purpoſe, ſhall after all remain terly *uſeleſs*, and *good for nothing*, merely becauſe the Words are

Latin; what can the original Language of his Authors be *good* for to Boys, who according to his Method are ſuppoſed to want ſome of theſe Advantages, and particularly the Knowledge of *Syntax* the moſt eſſential of them all?

§ 10. But having ſpoken of this ſomewhat already elſewhere, there is no Need I ſhould here further inſiſt upon it. It remains only that I ſhould conſider a little the grand *Reaſon* Mr. *Clarke* gives for this his ſtrange and unaccountable Conduct. And that in ſhort, as he tells us, *Eſſay upon Educ.* p. 17. is this, *That the Underſtanding and Practice of* Grammar Rules *require great Application, Attention and Labour of Thought, and for that Reaſon ſhould be let alone, till the Mind has been ripened and improved by Reading.*

§ 11. But to this I anſwer, 1. That without ſome *Application, Attention* and *Labour of Thought*, there is no Learning of even the firſt Principles of any dead Language, in a preceptive Manner at leaſt. There is good deal of *Application* and *Thought* requir'd to the Learning the *Declenſions* of Nouns, and much more to that of the *Conjugations* of Verbs; which yet, even in Mr. *Clarke*'s Judgment, it is abſolutely neceſſary that Boys ſhould be throughly acquainted with, before they proceed to his Authors.

Nay 2. I make no Doubt to declare it as my Opinion, that there is more *Attention* and *Labour of Thought* required to a Boy's making himſelf Maſter of this laſt as he ought, than to his Underſtanding the chief Rules of *Conſtruction*. This I am abſolutely certain of, that there is not one Thing that generally Boys are more deficient in than in the *Conjugations*, and that nothing proves a greater Obſtruction to their future Progreſs, than their Ignorance or Want of Application in theſe.

But 3. I maintain that there is ſuch an inſeparable Connection between the *Inflections* of Words and the chief *Conſtructions* of them, that no Boy can have any true Idea or Notion of the former, without knowing ſomething of the latter. This is evident from the various Terminations in the ſame Caſes of *Adjectives*, for which a Boy cannot poſſibly know any Reaſon, unleſs he alſo knows, that among the various *Subſtantives* to which they may be join'd, there are ſome that require one, ſome another, and ſome a third of theſe Terminations. This is likewiſe no leſs evident in the *Conjugation* of Verbs, eſpecially of the *Paſſive* Voice, a great Part whereof being made up of the Participle of the Preterperfect Tenſe and the Verb *ſum*, a Boy cannot know the Reaſon why he ſays *amatus ſum vel fui* in the Singular, and *amati ſumus vel fuimus* in the Plural, and not *amati ſum*, or *amatus ſumus*; and why again ſpeaking of *Women* he ſhould ſay *amata eſt*, and *amatæ ſunt*, and of ſeveral inanimate Creatures, *amatum eſt*, and *amata ſunt*, &c. without knowing the

eſe Participles are Adjectives, and have therefore ſuch and ſuch
rminations given them, becauſe of the Subſtantives to which they
long, *i. e.* without knowing that Rule of *Syntax*, that Adjectives
ght to agree with their Subſtantives, as in Number and Caſe, ſo
rticulary in Gender; of which laſt his own Language can hardly
ve him any Idea. I might alſo inſtance, why in the *Infinitive* he
ght to ſay *Me amare*, *te amare*, &c. and not *ego amare*, and *tu*
are, and again, why (if we can uſe that *Supine*) *Annam amatum*
, and *feminas amatum iri*, and yet *Annam amandam eſſe*, and
minas amandas eſſe, without knowing (beſides other Things) that
e Infinitive generally requires an Accuſative before it. Now, tho'
firſt the common *Paradigms* of Verbs muſt be gone through, with-
t taking Notice of thoſe Rules of Syntax, yet as that, without
eſe, can do no more than give the Boy a very rude and imperfect
otion of the *Conjugations*, it is plain, that before he can be ſaid to
ve any tolerable Knowledge of theſe *Conjugations*, he muſt, in the
equent Rehearſals that are afterwards to be made of them, be alſo
ade acquainted with ſuch Rules of *Syntax* as I have ſhew'd to be
ceſſary to the Underſtanding of them. If Mr. *Clarke* is afraid,
at this will put the Boy upon too much *Thinking*, he muſt alſo for
e ſame Reaſon drop the *Conjugations*, the Connection between
em being ſuch, that there is no learning of the one to Purpoſe,
ithout knowing ſomething of the other.

§ 12. Tho' this alone, and of itſelf, is ſufficient to overturn Mr.
larke's Scheme, yet 4. Suppoſing it were otherwiſe, and that
ore *Application* and *Labour of Thought* were required to the Un-
erſtanding of the Rules of *Syntax*, (as I confeſs, with reſpect to
verals of them, really there is) than to that of the *Declenſions* and
onjugations; yet, I ſay, that can be no good Reaſon, why ſo long
n Interval ſhould come in between them, *i. e.* that a Boy ſhould be
nly employed all that while in *Reading* (of which by the by it hard-
deſerves the Name) of ſeven or eight Authors with his *literal*
ranſlations, without ever meddling with any Thing of *Syntax*.
his appears contrary even to Mr. *Clarke*'s own Rule, which I al-
w to be a very juſt one, that Boys ought to proceed by *inſenſible*
egrees of Difference from what is leſs to what is more difficult. For
cording to his Method, they are carried from the *Conjugations*,
hich I have ſhew'd require a good deal of *Thought*, to the *Read-*
g (as he calls it) of Authors, which, ſays he, (and, if nothing
t the bare Signification of Words is intended, not untruly) *em-*
oys the Memory only. Had he contented himſelf with one or two
theſe Authors, he might perhaps have been excuſed; but to lead
em through ſuch a long Train of them, with no other View than
make them know the *Engliſh* of ſo many *Latin* Words, is what

I,

k, and I believe few others, will away with. This I am ſure of that the Difference that is between the Difficulty of learning the *Conjugations*, and that of the eaſier Rules of *Syntax*, ſuch as the two firſt *Concords*, the Government of *tranſitive Verbs*, that of *Prepoſitions*, and ſome others, is not ſo great as to require ſo long Time (a Year at leaſt, let him make what Speed he will) to prepare and open their Minds for it. I ſhall not diſpute the Point with him here whether the *Memory* is improv'd by Exerciſe or not: But tho' he after Mr. *Locke*, has thought fit, contrary to the Sentiment of *Quintilian* and others, to deny it, yet I hope neither of them will refuſe, that the *Judgment* can be, and is much improved by it. If ſo, what Reaſon can he give, why that Faculty in young ones ſhould ly ſo long reſtive and uncultivated, and their Minds be entirely taken up with Things of *mere Memory* only, and which after all, as I have already ſhew'd, is of very ſmall Significancy to their main Deſign. Boys, I confeſs, if left to themſelves, are naturally very unthinking Creatures: But, as that commonly proceeds, not ſo much from Want of *Capacity*, as of *Attention*, which is equally, tho' not in equal Degrees, neceſſary to the *Memory* as well as the *Judgment*; they ought not to be too much indulged in that trifling and inconſiderate Temper. And if this, as well as the other extreme, is carefully avoided, and a prudent Management all along uſed with them; I ſee nothing that hinders, why Boys may not immediately be carried from the *Conjugations* to the eaſier Rules of *Syntax*, either before, or together with ſome of theſe Authors, the chief Uſe and End whereof (ſo far as the Language is concerned) is to fix and imprint thoſe Rules the more deeply in their Minds. This was the conſtant Practice of all Maſters in former Ages, who may be ſuppoſed to know the Abilities of young ones, as well as Mr. *Clarke*. And unleſs Boys are become much duller in ours, than they were in thoſe Times, there muſt be ſtronger Reaſons advanced for it, than I have yet ſeen, before I give my Conſent for changing the ancient tho' vulgar Method.

I have only one Thing more to add concerning theſe *Literal Tranſlations* of Mr. *Clarke*, *viz.* That it is not a little ſurpriſing, that notwithſtanding he in his *Eſſay upon Education*, p. 89, is at a good deal of Pains to ſhew, that, of all the Claſſick Writers, *Caſar*, being the plaineſt and eaſieſt, is therefore the fitteſt for Boys to begin with, after they have done with *Cordery* and *Eraſmus*; yet all the While he has never provided them with a Tranſlation of that excellent Author; but, inſtead thereof, has laid out a good Part of his Time in tranſlating other Claſſicks of inferior Rank and Value, *Eutropius*, *Nepos*, *Florus*, *Juſtin* [illegible], already publiſhed; which he promiſes in a ſhort Space to add *Salluſt*. What ever may

ve been the Motive that has determined him to ſuch a Conduct, I not well ſee how it can conſiſt with his Rules of Education on o- er Accounts. For if his *Literal Tranſlations* are of ſuch mighty dvantage to young ones, that *they can do more*, as he tells us *p.* 34. *one Year with them, than in three or four without them*: it cannot t appear very incongruous, not to ſay unkind in him, to recom- end *Cæſar* as the moſt proper of all the *Roman* Authors for being ſt put into their Hands; and yet to deprive them of the Benefit of ch a *Tranſlation*, as would ſo much facilitate their Progreſs, and idge the Time that muſt otherwiſe be ſpent in the Learning of him.

F I N I S.

Errata in the Animadverſions on Mr. *Tr*ter's Grammar.

Pag. 6. lin. 21. and 36. for onyx *read* oryx.

Pag. 27. l. 24. after thoſe Days, *add*, Mr *Johnſon* in his Ad ons to his *Grammat. Comment.* p. 53. retracts his Opinion w reſpect to *pango*, which he had there ſaid, never ſignified to ſ And this he founds upon the following Paſſage from *Val. Maxi* lib. ii. cap. 1. *Majores natu ad tibias egregia ſuperiorum opera ca ne comprehenſa pangebant*, &c. I ſhall not diſpute the Goodne ſo ancient an Authority; far leſs pretend, with a late Commenta that the Reading there ſhould be *pandebant*, ſince, as he himſ owns, all the MSS. have *pangebant*, and ſome of the old Chriſt Poets, as *Prudentius* and *Fortunatus*, and in Imitation of them *Buchanan* uſe the Word in that Senſe: I only obſerve, that as true *Latin* Style begun to be altered in the Time of *Val. Maxim* ſo he, for ought appears, is the firſt that uſes the Verb *pango* in Signification of *Singing*.

Pag. 35. l. 33. for calamiti, *read* calamitati.

Pag. 38. l. 27. for ſexquipede, *read* ſeſquipede.

Pag. 39. l. 31. for Praſe, *read* Phraſe.

Errata in the Diſſertation, &c.

Pag. 6. l. 33. add, 'Tis true *Claudian*, who flouriſhed bout the Beginning of the Fifth Century, uſes *Pampinus* twice the Feminine Gender: But the Authority of that otherwiſe exc lent Poet, ſeems ſo little regarded by the old Grammarians, that is never, that I can diſcover, cited by them. This is certain, th no other Author I know of has it in that Gender; and *Columel* that lived very near the *Auguſtan* Age, and is therefore a mu purer Writer, always uſes the Word Maſculine, as *lib.* iii. *c.* 1 and *lib.* iv. *cap.* 29. twice.

Pag. 7. l. 9. read panaces.

Pag. 20. l. 11. after Sentences, *add* &c.

Ibid. l. 27. after Latin Tongue, *add*, The Inconſiſtencies obſe ved above, p. 6. & *ſeqq.* being added in Time of Printing.

Pag. 25. l. 16. for memor, *read* minor.

Pag. 40. l. 36. read hic receives.